

THIRTY-SEVENTH YEAR.

No. 428.

NEW SERIES.

No. 38.

# THE MONTH

*A Catholic Magazine.*

FEBRUARY, 1900.



PRICE ONE SHILLING.

LONDON :  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.

BALTIMORE: JOHN MURPHY AND Co.  
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO: BENZIGER BROTHERS.

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

## QUARTERLY SERIES.

### BIOGRAPHIES.

- The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier.** By the REV. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Two Vols. 10s. 6d.
- The Life of St. John Berchmans.** By the Rev. F. Goldie, S.J. Fifth Edition. 6s.
- The Story of St. Stanislaus Kostka.** Third and enlarged Edition. 4s. 6d.
- The Life of St. Alonso Rodriguez.** By the Rev. Father GOLDIE, S.J. 7s. 6d.
- The Life of St. Francis di Geronimo, of the Society of Jesus.** By A. M. CLARKE. 6s.
- The Life of St. Francis Borgia.** By A. M. CLARKE, author of *The Life of St. Francis di Geronimo*. The first Life of the Saint written in English. 6s. 6d.
- The Life of Blessed Antonio Baldinucci.** By Father FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J. 6s.
- The Life and Letters of St. Teresa.** Three vols. By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. 7s. 6d. each.
- The Chronicle of St. Antony of Padua.** "The Eldest Son of St. Francis." Edited by the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. In Four Books. 5s. 6d.
- The Life of St. Thomas of Hereford.** By Father L'ESTRANGE, S.J. 6s.
- The Life of St. Bridget of Sweden.** By F. J. M. A. PARTRIDGE. 6s.
- Acts of English Martyrs, hitherto unpublished.** By the Rev. JOHN H. POLLEN, S.J. With a Preface by the Rev. JOHN MORRIS, S.J. 7s. 6d.
- The Life of Augustus Henry Law, Priest of the Society of Jesus.** By ELLIS SCHREIBER. 6s.
- Distinguished Irishmen of the Sixteenth Century.** By the Rev. EDMUND HOGAN, S.J. 6s.
- Life of the Reverend Mother Mary of St. Euphrasia Pelletier, first Superior General of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers.** By A. M. CLARKE. 5s.
- The Life and Letters of Father John Morris, of the Society of Jesus. 1826—1893.** By Father J. H. POLLEN, S.J. 6s.
- The Story of Mary Aikenhead.** Foundress of the Irish Sisters of Charity. By MARIA NETHERCOTT. 3s.
- The Life of the Blessed Master John of Avila.** Secular Priest, called the Apostle of Andalusia. By Father LONGARO DEGLI ODDI, of the Society of Jesus. Edited by J. G. MACLEOD, S.J. Translated from the Italian. 4s.
- The Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln. (With Portrait.)** Translated from the French Carthusian Life, and Edited, with large additions, by the Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. 10s. 6d.

London: Burns and Oates (Limited), 28, Orchard Street, W.







### *Dr. Mivart's Recent Articles.*

---

IT is with sincere reluctance that we take up the pen to comment on Dr. St. George Mivart's recent articles in the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Fortnightly Review*. In the past his services to the cause of Catholicism in this country have been distinguished. His scientific reputation has always stood high, and he has written some works which will always be of value to the Catholic Apologist. Proportionately his name has been held in honour amongst us, even by the Holy Father himself, who gave him his doctor's degree, which at one time certainly he valued. Of a Catholic with that record it is painful to write anything in an adverse sense, and one might feel justified in passing over in silence, trusting that at least it was well-intentioned, any chance article which savoured imperfectly of the soundness of statement which is looked for in a Catholic writer. But in the face of these recent articles, duties to the Catholic public must override private feelings, for Dr. Mivart, though he guards himself carefully from saying how far his own acceptance of them goes, has at all events spoken sympathetically of a list of doctrines of which it is not excessive to say that they strike at the very foundations of Christianity; and has claimed for these subversive doctrines that they are actually held, or at least coming to be held, by the educated portion of the Catholic community, who find them not incompatible with Catholic communion. It is probable that, quite apart from any action on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, or protests from the organs of Catholic opinion, few will believe that such views are really tenable in the Catholic Church. Still the fact remains that, according to the assurance given, there are Catholics who believe them tenable and act on that belief; and the assurance comes from a writer who can truthfully describe himself as "one highly interested in all that concerns Catholicity, who has had certain advantages and opportunities for observation,

which those who are external to Catholicism cannot possess." When a situation so outrageous is declared to exist, it is quite impossible to keep silence.

In his *Nineteenth Century* article on "The Continuity of Catholicism," his point is that, contrary to the usual assumption that Rome is *semper eadem*, a very considerable transformation of belief has gone on among her adherents, is still proceeding, and seems destined in the future to assume still larger proportions, but that there is still no ground for asserting that it has caused a breach of continuity between ancient and modern Catholicism, the changes having been wrought by gradual and imperceptible stages, and never having led to any sudden disruption, such as divides ancient English Catholicism from modern Anglicanism. Were it true that any such transformation had taken place, especially one so radical as Dr. Mivart speaks of, surely no reasonable man could maintain a doctrinal continuity between our present and our past, and, unless combined with doctrinal continuity, continuity of government would be of no use, or rather, would be a delusion and a snare. Presumably, however, Dr. Mivart does not lay much stress on this continuity question, and employs it merely as a literary device to connect together the points of novel doctrine to the spreading acceptance of which he desires to bear testimony. This latter at all events is his chief point, and is the one with which we shall be concerned in the present article.

He sets before us in three classes a list of doctrines, none of which, he tells us, was thought to be tenable in earlier times, but of which those in the first class are now-a-days confessedly held by all, those in the second are notoriously held by many, whilst those in the third class, though at present held by a few only, need to be included in the list, because those who hold them belong to the number of the educated, and even to the *élite* among the educated, "whilst the fact that persons who are exceptionally learned, and no less exceptionally devout, have undergone any noteworthy change of belief at least shows that such change is possible and that it may spread further and even one day become general."

The first class of alleged novelties of doctrine on Dr. Mivart's list we can pass over slightly. He includes them not for their own sakes, but to support his suggestion that, as all must acknowledge that they were not held anciently and yet are

held now, there can be no ground, on the mere plea of their being novelties, for refusing to consider the claims of other novelties, the acceptance of which is as yet only partial. The suggestion fails, however, for there has been no change whatever in the Church's faith in regard to the doctrines in Dr. Mivart's first class.

The dogma *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, was never understood to mean more than what our Lord meant when He said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but He that believeth not shall be condemned."<sup>1</sup> It never meant more than that there is a Divine commandment to join the Catholic Church, and this commandment being such must be obeyed under pain of eternal loss. It was never understood to mean that disregard of the commandment proceeding, not from wilful rejection of its claims, but from invincible ignorance of its existence, carries with it any punishment, though of course it carries with it the loss of the far more abundant aids to salvation which are to be found in the Catholic Church only. There has indeed been a very considerable change in our mode of estimating who and how many are thus invincibly ignorant of their obligation. But that is not a matter of dogma; it is only a matter of inference and conjecture—except for the persons themselves outside the Church who must know in their own hearts the quality of their dispositions.

Nor has there been any real change in the Church's attitude towards Usury, though to those whose study of the subject has been only superficial, there may easily seem to have been change. She still holds it unlawful to exact interest for the loan of money which would never be borrowed were the borrower not in urgent necessity, and if not lent would necessarily have to lie idle. That, she still says, is no fair transaction, for there is no fair exchange of advantages. But she never held it unlawful for the lender to require compensation for any loss entailed on him by the loan, as for instance when the money to be lent had to be withdrawn from some profit-making industry; or for him to require his fair share, in proportion to the amount advanced, in any profit-making industry in which his money was to be embarked. Where the change, no doubt a mighty one, has come in is in the wide extension of the world's markets which characterizes our days, and causes occasions such as those mentioned to become ordinary, whereas before they were

<sup>1</sup> St. Mark xvi. 16.

exceptional. But this change also has nothing to do with dogma.

And so too of intolerance and persecution. In principle—and the dogma affects only the principle—the Catholic Church always has been and always must be intolerant. She must always be intolerant of heresy in the same sense in which the State must always be intolerant of treason. In one case as in the other, the offence is not against the rules of some private and purely voluntary association, but against a public authority conscious that it possesses a God-given right to the allegiance of its subjects. Still principle is one thing, the policy and method of applying it is another, and in the case of heresy as of treason a great change has been obviously wrought in the mode of dealing with the offender. And the same softening of feeling which has led States to revise their cruel tariffs of punishment, and more readily to conceive excuses for certain classes of offenders, has had its counterpart in the breasts of Churchmen. Even if, which is most unlikely, the Papacy were to regain the power it wielded in the middle ages, it is as inconceivable that the Church's rulers should wish to re-introduce the punishment of burning, as it is inconceivable that a modern State should wish to re-introduce the rack and the quartering-block. Probably they would treat heresy as the State treats many offences against itself, visiting the offender with disapprobation, but would not wish to punish him except by spiritual censures.

Mr. Mivart cites two more illustrations of changes of belief which he finds to be now universal. But the three we have discussed must suffice to show that this class of changes is not in any sense incompatible with the persistency of the Church's creed. We may call them developments, but they are not novelties, and are certainly not negations of what was formerly held, and so differ essentially from the unquestionable novelties and negations in Dr. Mivart's second and third class, to which we must now pass.

We must be content with a selection from his instances, and so passing over some points of less importance, we may take, in the first place, a novelty of belief now declared to be tenable, in examining which we shall be able to touch the mainspring of this strange theory, that the Catholic Church remains no longer "always the same," but, on the contrary, has become "always shifting." Dr. Mivart writes :

Another most important change which is taking place amongst Catholics is the change which consists in regarding as specially to be valued, not that which is most ancient, but that which is most recent. This new belief may be shortly expressed by the maxim, "Opinions which are newest are generally truest."

In other words, the time-honoured principle of St. Vincent of Lerins—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—is in the course of being abandoned by Catholics of light and leading. Dr. Mivart says so explicitly: "Instead of proclaiming that to be true which has been believed *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, we may say confidently that whatsoever has been so believed is most probably false."

It does not argue well for Dr. Mivart's carefulness in consulting his authorities—and we shall find other instances pointing the same way—that he should speak of Newman as having "initiated and mainly promoted this change of view" in England, citing his *Development of Christian Doctrine*, and "his demonstration of the superiority of the Fathers who wrote after the Council of Nice compared with the ante-Nicene Fathers." Cannot Dr. Mivart, scientific man as he is, see the difference between the downright rejection of a dogma once firmly held and the logical development of the science of understanding its contents? Newman treated of Development, as the name of his book declares. It is not excessive to describe the object of Dr. Mivart's articles as being to pour contempt on the notion that Development can be of any avail in meeting the difficulties raised by modern science and criticism. And it is something essentially different which he means when he lays down the principle that "opinions which are the newest are generally truest." Let us listen to him again:

What could be more absurd (he asks) with respect to any question of modern science, than to seek enlightenment in works written ages before such questions were even thought of? For example, what light can we expect to gain as to the problems of man's origin; his relative nature; . . . the authorship and date of the books of the Old and New Testaments; the meaning of various obscure passages therein to be found; or the exact nature of the doctrines and organization of primitive Christianity; by addressing ourselves, not to learned experts who have severally made one or other of these questions their life-long study, but to the teaching of ecclesiastics who may not have really studied them at all, but formed conclusions on a *priori* grounds; such as the words of Scripture, the unanimous consent of the Fathers, or

the ordinary teaching of generations of ecclesiastics, who knew still less about the subjects concerning which they profess to express a judgment, than themselves?

How could he possibly suppose that Newman had given any countenance to such a contention as this, which it would be closer to the truth to say that Newman spent all his life precisely in opposing? For what it really amounts to is this, that there never was such a thing as a Christian revelation given by God to man, or at least that it has practically perished. If there has been no revelation given, pledging the wisdom and the truth of God for its contents, we have nothing upon which to fall back save the straining after truth of the human mind, and in that case obviously the later opinions are likely to be the best, as representing a longer reflection and a fuller experience. But if there was ever a *Dixit Deus*, and it has been preserved to us through a secure channel, it must be more trustworthy than any reasonings of men, and we shall not be acting irrationally, but rather adopting the only truly rational course, if we disregard, when in conflict with it, even the opinions of "learned experts who have made of certain questions their life-long study." Nor will it be of vital consequence if the ecclesiastics, the succession of Fathers and theologians, who form the connecting channel by handing down the teaching of this *Dixit Dominus*, are not themselves scientific experts, nor have thought of testing the contents of their message by scientific proofs. We do not reject the message brought us by a messenger, even though his education has not qualified him to understand it, and even though his message may contradict the opinions expressed to us by a scientific bystander. What we do is to compare the scientific repute of the bystander with that of the sender of the message, whilst of the messenger we only ask if he has delivered his message correctly. And it is here that the "words of Scripture," "the unanimous consent of the Fathers," and "the ordinary teaching of generations of ecclesiastics" come in. They must come in, if our Lord really gave a revelation, and appointed the Church to be its guardian and transmitter. Where an individual Father or theologian speaks apart, we attach only that importance to his words which accrues to them from his known acquaintance with the subject-matter. They are his words, not the Church's. Nor can we always attach a decisive importance to the con-

sentient opinion of Fathers and theologians combined. It may be that they are simply expressing the ideas everywhere current in their times, in which case they are the ideas of their times and not of the Church. But when they agree about matters in regard to which they profess to speak, not as private thinkers but as public *witnesses*, handing down their testimony to what the Church of their day believed to be revealed truth, and persisting in this testimony from generation to generation, then we say that such testimony is not the mere opinion of the individuals or of their times, but the testimony of the Church herself. There could not be that agreement among them unless the Church did teach those doctrines and bear that testimony. Dr. Mivart ridicules this idea of the Church conceived as a concrete entity possessing a mind, or stock of doctrines, or traditions, and bearing testimony to them. What, he asks, is the Church save an abstraction, and her mind save the abstraction of an abstraction? But here he is apparently confusing the term "abstraction" with the term "collective entity." Ordinarily we should say that the idea of a nation is an abstraction, but a particular nation, as the British nation, we should speak of as the concrete collective entity corresponding to that abstraction. Nor do we find it unnatural to ascribe to such a concrete and collective entity a peculiar mind, or spirit, or temperament, or traditions, or attachments, or prejudices, and to account these as distinct from those of the individuals composing it, though ascertained from the latter by the application of tests similar in kind to what in theology we call the unanimous consent of the Fathers and the ordinary teaching of the Church. Where the difference comes in is that, the testimony and teaching of the Church being guarded from corruption by the special overruling providence of the Holy Spirit, these tests become in her case tests of infallible truth, whilst no one claims that for the similar tests by which we ascertain the persuasions and principles of some form of civil society.

In view of its fundamental character, we have dwelt thus at length on the examination of this novel principle, "The newest opinions are generally the truest," and its relation to the old Catholic principle, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, which is said to be superseded by it. We trust to have made it clear that the distance between the two is not small, but is the whole distance between acceptance and rejection



of the Catholic faith as a genuine revelation from God to man. And here, unfortunately, Dr. Mivart leaves us in no doubt as to his own participation in the novel view he chronicles. He speaks distinctly as from himself in the paragraph which has been transcribed from his pages.

Next we come to a novel view on the character of Holy Scripture. In former times, he tells us, it was held to be "an entirely supernatural work," comprising the entire canon of the Old and New Testaments, with all their parts, all of which were held to be written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and to be free from error of every kind. And this he still allows to be the "official belief enjoined on Catholics," a belief enjoined from the earliest times, but made progressively more distinct by the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, and enforced with greater distinctness still by "that shocking document," the *Providentissimus Deus*. Nevertheless, this official belief has simply "vanished." "Educated persons no longer feel bound to regard the Bible in the old light," and even Leo XIII., the author of the *Providentissimus Deus*, hardly believed what he said, his "declaration that the Bible contains no error (being) but a formal parade, only saved from falsehood by a more ingenious than honest distinction between 'errors' and 'untruths'"; whilst "a theologian at Rome, formally serving the Pope as such, would not venture to deny that hundreds of statements which are not 'true' are to be found in the Old and New Testaments."

Previously to the *Providentissimus Deus* there were Catholic students who thought it possible to limit the truth-guarding influence of inspiration to the spiritual and moral aspects of the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Mivart has quite misunderstood the nature of the distinction, which he here pronounces to be "more ingenious than honest." In his *Fortnightly Review* article he censures Dr. Robert F. Clarke for advocating it, but he will find it advocated also in a book for which he expresses much admiration, though he does not always treat it fairly—viz., Dr. Hogan's *Clerical Studies*. (pp. 473—475.) The principle involved is suggested by the *Providentissimus Deus* itself, and is clearly reasonable, though there may be controversy as to the extent of its lawful application. It is that before we can decide whether a writer speaks the truth or not we must first be certain what sense he attaches to his words out of the possible senses which the words can bear. Thus, to take a simple instance, in recording a speech, as of Josue, did the writer mean that those were Josue's *ipsissima verba*? To decide on this, and many kindred but more difficult questions, Drs. Clarke and Hogan say, and most truly, as it seems to us, that you must study the context in a large sense of that word, which includes a study of the literary methods of the age in which the sacred writer lived. The subject is much too vast to be expounded even in outline in a short foot-note, but Dr. Hogan has sufficiently indicated the ground that has to be examined.



language of Holy Scripture. Dr. Mivart is by no means content with that. Nothing short of an unqualified denial of its unique character will satisfy him. "God is the real author of all that is best and noblest in the thoughts, deeds, and words—spoken or written—of mankind. Can we venture to deny that Homer and Plato, Æschylus and Aristotle, Virgil and Tacitus, Dante and Shakspeare, were in various degrees 'inspired'?" In that sense he will allow Holy Scripture to be inspired (for here also he speaks in his own name), but in no other sense.

Granted these two propositions, that the newest opinions are generally the truest, and that the Old and New Testaments have no more claim to our acceptance than attaches to books written by purely human authors in pre-critical times, and replete with palpable errors and contradictions, we cannot wonder that he should also deny to the Church any right to be the authentic interpreter of the meaning of Scripture. "Four hundred years ago," he says, "that right was universally allowed and conceded by the laity, but in the seventeenth century, thanks to the confessorship of that venerable servant of God, Galileo, the futility of such a claim was once for all demonstrated." Catholic students note that infallibility has not been claimed for the tribunal which condemned Galileo, and that it cannot therefore have been so completely compromised by its mishap on that occasion. A tribunal which, not claiming to be infallible, makes a mistake occasionally in its own subject-matter, may still be so generally trustworthy in regard to it as to be safely entrusted with the right of authoritative decision. Indeed, were it otherwise, what tribunal on earth could be entrusted with authority of any kind? Even "those who know" may, and do, make mistakes in their own departments of science and criticism, which nevertheless, banding together, they can be intolerant enough to require others to accept, under pain of ostracism from the ranks of the educated and intelligent; and as for matters of theology, Dr. Mivart's two articles contain more mistakes—not misjudgments as to their value merely, but sheer mistakes as to the facts of their teaching—than could be equalled by the Congregation of the Inquisition in a dozen or more Galileo cases. This, however, is a matter we need not pursue.

A more important point for us at present is that Dr. Mivart does not deny the right to interpret Scripture with authority merely to the Congregation of the Inquisition. He denies it to

ecclesiastical authority of every rank and degree, to the Pope as much as to his subordinates ; at least this is all we can gather from his language, which makes no reservations for them, but describes the change of belief that has taken place simply as regarding "the right and power of ecclesiastical authority to interpret" Scripture. It is this authority which he tells us the "venerable servant of God, Galileo," has discredited for ever, and discredited so effectually, that he is filled with amazement that it should not recognize and bow before the fact. "In spite of its absurdity," he says, "the Roman Curia has again ventured to show its now broken teeth, and stretch out its now blunted claws against worthy ecclesiastics, and that as regards a biological question, namely, the Origin of Man." And "(he) hardly knows whether to be more diverted by the impudent folly of such proceedings, or moved to indignation by their immorality ;" but finds consolation in remembering that "happily the Curialists are, to quote the words of an Italian doctor of divinity who knows them well, 'as impotent as they are unscrupulous and corrupt.'" It is necessary to bring out his words, as they show the lengths to which Dr. Mivart is prepared himself to go. But it is distressing to be obliged to quote these indiscriminate charges against men whom Leo XIII. has called to his counsels, charges which are most unjust, and for which he can give us no other authority than that of a nameless person. Nor are the phrases just quoted the worst he allows himself to employ against those whose ecclesiastical action displeases him. In the *Fortnightly Review* he actually refers to a distinguished Cardinal in terms such as these : "If my information is correct, the natural science to which Cardinal Satolli is most devoted is mineralogy, and especially metallurgy, he having acquired in the United States a very large collection of specimens in the form of dollars." Dr. Mivart has complained to the newspapers of some phrases used about himself by some of his critics. What would he have said if any one of his critics had spoken of him with the license he allows himself in regard to Cardinal Satolli and his fellow-Cardinals? He speaks too of Mr. Wilfrid Ward as not scrupling to repeat "an abominable falsehood."

Dr. Mivart does not himself fix the dividing line running between the second and the third class of new doctrines in his catalogue, but we may probably fix it at the point to which we have now come. Certainly, it has not hitherto been "generally known," or even suspected, that we had in our midst persons who

deliberately held the doctrines which follow in that catalogue, whilst still outwardly bearing the character of devout Catholics, and approaching the sacraments; nor can Dr. Mivart have been unprepared for the outburst of horror and indignation with which his announcement of their existence has been received in Catholic circles. These professing Catholics, it seems, have quite abandoned the old Christian notion of sin. They cannot continue to regard Almighty God as "a non-natural Oriental Despot"—so runs their caricature of the Christian idea—"exact-ing praise and adoration, and ready to chastise with the utmost severity any withholding thereof;" as one towards whom the most fitting conduct is "abject self-abasement, piteous entreaties, and endeavours to ward off chastisement for demerits by self-torture and the presentation of the virtuous acts of others." They can regard Him only as "a being to whom impieties are unwelcome (merely) because prejudicial to the moral and intellectual welfare of those who commit or utter them." And Dr. Mivart is thankful to say that "with the vanishing of such morbid notions" about sin, "morbid notions about Hell are rapidly vanishing also," and that "some writings of (his) own have helped to banish them from many Catholic minds."

Of course the notion of original sin has in the judgment of these professing Catholics gone by the board along with the "ancient" notion of sin in general, and "no man of education now regards the Biblical account of the fall as more than a myth." Moreover, so radical a transformation of the idea of sin, which underlies the Biblical account of the Redemption, has naturally led to a corresponding abandonment of this latter doctrine also. According to "many modern Catholics as orthodox (?) as learned, . . . Christ's life and death have served to set before us a great 'object-lesson;' such Catholics (affirming) that beyond this, they know not, and that no one knows, *how* man was benefited by the Passion of Christ Jesus."

When we find the doctrine of Redemption so transformed, we are prepared for anything, and are not surprised to hear that the belief in our Lord's conception by the Holy Ghost and His virginal birth, together with the belief in the immunity from corruption of His Sacred Body while it rested in the tomb, are given up by these New Catholics. As regards the former of these, to Dr. Mivart's "certain knowledge, there are actually devout Catholics of both sexes, well known and highly esteemed, weekly communicants, and leading lives devoted to charity and

religion, who believe Joseph to have been the real and natural father of Jesus." He knows "even priests who share this opinion, and (has) heard a devout and ascetic Religious affirm—not in (his) presence alone—that he thought the extraordinary dignity to which Rome has now raised St. Joseph may have been providentially brought about in preparation for a great change in popular sentiment and credence on this question."

One would have thought this was enough, but we are told of something still more outrageous. According to Dr. Mivart's testimony, "a man devoted to the cause of Catholicity, . . . when seeking the advice of a learned and austere priest," after expressing views about the nature of the Divine attributes which, as he truly recognized, "amount to polytheism,"<sup>1</sup> delivered himself of the following sentiments :

Amongst such devout persons (*i.e.*, "good Catholics") are some who would prefer to worship God under one of His attributes, symbolized by representations more resembling Athene and Apollo, and who have specially felt the want in Christianity of a female symbol of Divinity ; for of course God is as much female as He is male. I have heard there are persons who go to the Brompton Oratory there to worship the Madonna, as the only available representative of Venus ; and we have lately read of the recent worship (in Paris) of Isis, by persons who regarded the goddess, whose veil no man has drawn aside, as no inapt symbol of the inscrutable power that everywhere meets, yet everywhere escapes, our gaze as we seek to probe the mysteries of Nature. In conclusion, I would ask whether it would be lawful for me, as a Catholic, to worship God as Zeus or Athene if I am in truth devoutly moved so to adore Him.

And Dr. Mivart pledges his word for what would otherwise be simply incredible, that the "learned and devout priest" answered the question put to him thus : "Most certainly it is lawful for you to do so, provided it helps you to advance in virtue and religion. But you must do it privately ; it would not at present be right for you to carry on a public worship of that kind." Dr. Mivart tells us that this answer was given in his hearing, and that he "subsequently asked the same question of

<sup>1</sup> He says, "God's attributes, while distinct, are each of them equally God, and therefore substantial. We can hardly then venture to affirm or deny that they are *substantially distinct and distinctly substantial*." If these words mean anything, they must mean that God may be a congeries of substances.

three other learned and experienced priests, and received a similar reply from them all."<sup>1</sup>

Such is the system of novel doctrines which, according to Dr. Mivart, are now held by many Catholics, some openly, others secretly, and it has been shown—though it did not need to be shown—that they are in the sharpest antagonism to the Catholic Faith, are, in fact, downright heresies. It remains to add a few words on the personal questions which arise out of the situation.

In the first place as regards Dr. Mivart himself. Although it is true that, in his letter addressed to the *Times* and other papers, he "protests against being supposed to have adopted all the novel views to which (he) had occasion to refer," it is also true that he carefully abstains, in that letter as well as in the articles, from saying that he does not adopt them all, and we have seen that he speaks of them all in a tone of sympathy and in the language of an advocate. We have seen also that he distinctly rejects in his own name the integrity and inspiration of the Bible, adopting the most advanced views of the rationalistic critics, and likewise rejects in his own name the infallibility of the Church in preserving her deposit and interpreting Holy Scripture. In other words, he pronounces in his own name the entire groundwork of faith to be unsound and untrustworthy. Going so far, we cannot but infer, as he leaves us to our inferences, that he really goes further still, for the wonder would be if he did not. Given belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture and in the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, it is not difficult to believe every article of the Catholic Faith. But if it were necessary to reject these attestations of revealed truth, we cannot imagine where he is to find elsewhere sufficient evidence to warrant acceptance of such doctrines as those concerning the Birth and Resurrection of our Lord; yes, and still less of such stupendous mysteries as those of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, or the Real Presence. We feel bound to insist on this question of Dr. Mivart's own personal opinions, because, on reaching this stage of the article, we learn that the Cardinal has inhibited him from receiving the sacraments, until he is prepared to disavow all these novel doctrines of which he

<sup>1</sup> We must not omit to say that in a foot-note to this passage Dr. Mivart tells us that the "questioner had no idea of worshipping the mythological characters Zeus, Athene, &c., but only attributes of the Supreme (majesty, wisdom, beauty, power, love, &c.) which these old Greek types embody." But here the note seems to contradict the text.

speaks. It is sad indeed that it should have come to that, but it is what Catholics generally have been expecting, and what Dr. Mivart must have foreseen and perhaps was challenging. The Catholic Church is not a communion which delights in its comprehensiveness. It is the union under one head of those who unfeignedly believe and profess the faith of which that one head is the supreme visible Teacher. And the Bishop is the appointed guardian of the sacraments in his diocese, to see that they are given only to those who can approach in the right dispositions, of which this sincere adherence to the teaching of the Church as determined by the Holy See is the most fundamental of all. Of course if people come to the sacraments without divulging their heterodox beliefs, the ecclesiastical authority can do nothing. But as soon as it is aware of the abuse, it must needs repress it to the extent of its power.

This last observation leads us on naturally to a judgment on the conduct of the clique of professing Catholics who, Dr. Mivart assures us, hold these monstrously un-Catholic doctrines in secret, and yet do not hesitate to use the Church's sacraments, and the name of Catholic. We should be glad to think that they do not exist, but apparently they do. Some, indeed, of those whom he cites as sanctioning the heterodox opinions, Dr. Mivart has apparently misunderstood. Certainly he has misunderstood the "distinguished and highly-placed Roman theologian" whom he cites as allowing that the purpose of our Lord's death on the Cross may have been only that we might have a great object-lesson put before us. Evidently the theologian merely gave the common opinion of the theologians, after St. Thomas, that antecedently God was not constrained to restore us through a redemption in which the claims of Divine justice were expiated, but selected this means in view of the impressive lesson and example it sets us; but this is a very different thing from questioning whether the Crucifixion was an expiatory sacrifice. The other "learned theologian, high in office and in great favour with the Pope," seems likewise to have been misunderstood. The corruption of the body is not in itself incompatible with its subsequent resurrection, for were it otherwise our own bodies could not be raised at the last day; and if any one were to object that corruption destroys the links of personal identity, this theologian's answer, "that we do not know in what the essence of a body consists," is one likely to be given. But as regards our Lord's Resurrection other con-

siderations come in, and it would be surprising indeed if this theologian, if asked, did not deny vehemently that he perceived "nothing innocuous to religion" in the opinion that our Lord's Sacred Body "saw corruption" in the grave.

Still, when the needful deductions have been made on the score of these probable misunderstandings, it is evident, from Dr. Mivart's assurances, that we really have in our midst persons of the kind he describes, such as those (seemingly) "devout Catholics of both sexes, well known and highly esteemed (by those unaware of their secret ways)—weekly communicants and leading lives devoted to charity and religion—who believe Joseph to have been the real and natural father of Jesus;" and even as those loathsome creatures who "go to the Brompton Oratory to thus worship the Madonna, as the only available representative of Venus;" or, alas! that it should have to be said, as "the learned and austere priest," and the "three other learned and experienced priests," who were not ashamed to tell "a man devoted to the cause of Catholicity," that he might worship God as Zeus or Athene, but at present must only do it privately.

It is certain that this esoteric group exists, though their number is probably insignificant, but "what is to be done with them?" every orthodox Catholic is asking; "are they to be allowed to continue thus profaning our sacraments?" Of course if they were known, their Ordinaries would have to forbid them the sacraments; but, as long as they conceal their beliefs, nothing can be done, unless an appeal to their sense of what is honourable and dishonourable in human conduct, can reach their ears.

The Ethics of Conformity are touched upon by Dr. Mivart in his *Fortnightly Review* article, where he contends, if we understand him rightly, that it is lawful for those more enlightened Catholics, whose views profoundly differ from the beliefs of the Catholic populace around them, still to join in the rites of the Catholic Church, on the same principles which induced enlightened philosophers like the Emperor Julian to join in the rites of Pagan worship; on the principle, namely, that such rites are bonds which unite men together powerfully, and support their religious and social aspirations and enterprises. We must presume that it is for a reason like this that the group of ultra-heterodox Catholics use our sacraments, not for what they are in the belief of the Church, but for a different and



private purpose of their own. But if that is the case there is one important matter which they overlook. Conformity is of the nature of a bi-lateral compact. A man must consider not merely what he may himself desire, but what the Church whose rites he seeks, as represented by her ruling authorities, and the mass of her children, in accordance with her age-long traditions, imposes on him as the requisite conditions. Let us take a parallel. The persuasion is not so common as it was, but still exists in some quarters, that Catholic ecclesiastics, especially Jesuits, are wont to disguise themselves as Anglican ministers, and minister at Anglican altars. Of course such a thing does not happen, but if it did, we all quite acknowledge that the practice would be rightly characterized as dishonourable and fraudulent. Yet, what is the difference between such a practice, and what Dr. Mivart tells us is the practice of these secret folk who pride themselves on their superior enlightenment? They pride themselves, also, we are told, on the greater refinement of ethical intuition which marks the stage of advancing change which they have been the first to reach. Have they not rather, in this matter of unwarrantable conformity, fallen into a very abyss of ethical depravity?

We put this question in no wont of considerateness for the difficulties of their position. We can quite understand how the Catholic Church—the Mighty Mother, as Newman calls her—can by her moral and spiritual beauty hold the admiration and affection even of those who have brought themselves to disbelieve in her doctrines and teaching authority; and how they can be reluctant to cut themselves off from all participation in her spiritual gifts. And we can understand how the effect may be to make them one-sided and apt to overlook the true nature of their unlawful conformity. Still they cannot be allowed to overlook it, for there is only one verdict concerning it which a man of right feeling can give.

S. F. S.



## *Fresh Light on the Early History of the Mass.*

AN important discovery recently made and given to the public by Mgr. Ignatius Ephraem Rahmani, the Syriac Patriarch of Antioch, has thrown, if we mistake not, fresh light on the history of the Mass, or more strictly on the history of the gradual development of that framework of prayers and ceremonies wherein the central act of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is enshrined. It is in this sense that we shall use the word "Mass" in the following pages, viz., as the equivalent of the longer phrase "the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass;" and it will be convenient to deal with the subject in the first instance independently of the discovery to which we have just referred, and which shall be introduced in its proper place.

Of the early Fathers of the Church, no one has given so clear and explicit a description of the liturgy as St. Justin. The passage is well-known, but as it serves for the point of departure for all serious investigation, both upwards and downwards, into the history of the Mass, it deserves to be given here in full. To this extent alone shall we venture to abridge St. Justin's words, that for the sake of avoiding repetition we fuse two paragraphs into one. This will best suit the purposes of the general reader; the actual text is easily accessible to students. This, then, is what St. Justin says:

On Sunday an assembly (*ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις*) of all the faithful of the district is held, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets, are read, as far as time allows (*μέχρις ἐγχώρει*).<sup>1</sup> When the reader has finished, the president (*i.e.*, the bishop) gives an instruction and an exhortation upon what has been read (*νοουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μνήσεως*). Then we all rise and put up

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Probst (*Lit. d. drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 42) calls attention to the fact that in 1 Cor. vi. 20, the phrase *συνελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* is used by St. Paul in connection with the Eucharistic celebration. But the use of *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* in Acts i. 15, ii. 1, 44, seems to be conclusive (if an argument were needed) against giving an exclusively specific meaning to a phrase which is *per se* of quite general significance.

prayers (εὐχὰς πέμπομεν)<sup>1</sup> in common, both for ourselves and for those who have been baptized, and for all others whosoever they may be (ὑπὲρ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων), very earnestly (εὐτόνος),<sup>2</sup> to the intent that having attained to the knowledge of the truth the further grace may be vouchsafed to us that we may be found to be of good conversation by our deeds (δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοῖ πολιτευταί), and observers of the commandments, whereby we may gain eternal salvation. When we have finished these prayers, we salute one another with the kiss of peace. Then bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to him who presides over the brethren, and he having received them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at great length (ἐπὶ πολὺ, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ) for having been deemed worthy of these things by Him (ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιώσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ). And after he has finished the prayers and thanksgiving all the people cry aloud, "Amen," which word in Hebrew signifies, "So be it." And after the president has finished his thanksgiving and the people have responded, those who among us are called deacons distribute the bread and wine over which the thanksgiving has been uttered to all those who are present, and carry them to those who are absent.<sup>3</sup>

Here it is obvious that we have an outline of the liturgy of the Mass as it was celebrated, presumably at Rome, in St. Justin's time. The service thus described consisted of the following items:

1. Lessons from the apostolical or prophetic writings.
2. A Homily by the Bishop on what had been read.
3. Solemn prayers, made by all in common, for the faithful at large, and in particular for the recently baptized (at least when baptism had just been conferred).
4. The Kiss of Peace.
5. The presentation of the bread and mixed chalice to the Bishop.
6. A long thanksgiving prayer, made by the Bishop, to which the people answer, Amen.
7. The Communion.

The relation of these items of the early Roman liturgy to the Mass as we now know it is in great measure clear enough, and a very few remarks on each head will suffice before we pass to the more particular consideration of No. 6 in the series, which is clearly the most important of all.

1. The lessons from the apostolical or prophetic writings survive, of course, in our Epistle and Gospel, and in the more numerous lessons which are still in use on the Wednesdays and

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* i. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Read rather, ἐκτενῶς.

<sup>3</sup> *Apol.* i. 65 and 67 combined.

Saturdays of the Ember weeks. And although there is much which might be said concerning the various schemes of liturgical lessons from Holy Scripture, which have prevailed at different times and in different rites, these details need not be here discussed.

2. It is interesting to note that the sermon or homily after the Gospel is no interpolation or innovation of a relatively late date, but has formed an integral, though of course not an essential, portion of the solemn Sunday liturgy from the earliest times. Dr. Amberger in his *Pastoraltheologie* has developed at considerable length the idea that in the Mass our Lord officiates, through His ministers, in His threefold character as Prophet or Teacher, as Priest, and as King; as Teacher in the Scriptural lessons and the homily, as Priest in the consecration with its framework of prayers and ceremonies; as King when He comes to take possession of our hearts in that sacrament of His love which is in very deed the marriage supper of the King. And this contention of Dr. Amberger, so far as it concerns its first point, is at least illustrated by the undoubted fact that instruction formed, as has been said, an integral portion of the primitive Eucharistic service, at least in its more solemn and public form.

3. The prayers which St. Justin describes as put up by all in common after the conclusion of the sermon, answer—as has long since been recognized—to the series of petitions for various classes of persons in the Church which, so far as the Roman rite is concerned, have survived in their fulness only on Good Friday. Their correspondence with the principal collect of an ordinary Mass in the Roman Missal is less obvious, but is at least highly probable. The transfer of this principal collect from its primitive position after the Gospel to that which it now holds before the Scripture lessons can be readily explained.<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that the prayers in question, in their original form, appear to have been pronounced, not by the Bishop but by the Deacon, a usage which still survives in the *Diakonika* of the Eastern liturgies, and which can be traced back to the oldest extant documents.<sup>2</sup>

4. The Kiss of Peace has, in the Roman rite, been transferred from its old position before the distinctively sacrificial portion of the service to the moment immediately preceding the

<sup>1</sup> On this point see the *Dublin Review*, December, 1895, p. 585.

<sup>2</sup> Viz., the Clementine Liturgy (Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 3, seq.), and the *Testamentum D.N.J.C.* (to be hereafter described), pp. 83, seq.

Communion. In the East it still holds its original place, of which possibly a trace still survives amongst ourselves when, in a Pontifical Mass, the Bishop salutes the people with the words "Pax vobis," immediately before the Collect.<sup>1</sup>

5. The simple act of presenting to the officiating Bishop the elements to be consecrated has in various liturgies been embodied in and supplemented by a variety of prayers and ceremonies of which the Offertory of the Roman Mass (taking the word Offertory in a wide sense) exhibits only one type, probably of Gallican provenance.

6. But the item on which we would lay most particular stress is that which occupies the sixth place in the list, viz., the long thanksgiving prayer, the *Εὐχαριστία* properly so called, which, with the Communion, is plainly the essential element in the liturgy. Our present "Preface" clearly answers to the commencement at least of St. Justin's thanksgiving prayer. About this there can be no manner of doubt, nor has any one ever called this in question. And it may perchance help our devotion in hearing or celebrating Holy Mass, to bear in mind that in reciting the Preface, we are engaged upon a form of prayer which—having regard to its structure and general purport, rather than to its actual words—is, with the sole exception of the words of consecration, absolutely the most primitive portion of the Mass. And yet the correspondence of our Preface with the Eucharistia of St. Justin is only partial. For the latter is plainly a single continuous formula, variable at the discretion of the Bishop (as is implied by the words *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ*), but proceeding without interruption until at its conclusion, *after the consecration*, the people respond "Amen." And this is the point on which, in these few pages, we wish most particularly to insist, viz., that the Eucharistia or Thankprayer (if we may be allowed to coin a technical term after the analogy of the German *Dankgebet*) in its primitive form *included the consecration*. It is true that in the so-called Clementine liturgy, which is contained in the Eighth Book of the "Apostolical Constitutions," a Thankprayer which more closely answers to our Preface is immediately followed, or its continuity broken, by the *Tersanctus*, i.e., by the words, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts," &c., concerning which it is

<sup>1</sup> More probably, however, these words are a survival of the exhortation with which the celebrant saluted the clergy on first entering the sanctuary. For examples see Brightman, pp. 33, 115, 146.

explicitly prescribed in a rubrical direction that they shall be chanted by all the people. But we cannot bring ourselves to believe that this was the primitive usage. For if such a custom had prevailed in St. Justin's time, it is incredible that he should have passed over in silence this solemn chant, considering that he twice mentions, with some emphasis, the final response or acclamation, "Amen."

And, indeed, this view of the matter appears to us to be in entire accordance with antecedent probability. If we start with the hypothesis which is suggested by the very name *εὐχαριστία*, viz., that the central element of the whole service was a prayer of thanksgiving, it is almost incredible that this form of thanksgiving, in its original shape, should have been brought to an end by the *Tersanctus* before any mention of the mystery of the Eucharist itself had yet been made. When St. Justin says that the Bishop "gave thanks . . . for having been made (or for that we have been made) worthy of these things," it can hardly be questioned that "these things" are the consecrated elements, concerning which he presently goes on to say that they are not "common bread and common wine," but that after the thanksgiving has been pronounced over the elements, they are "the flesh and blood of Jesus." And the expression, *τὴν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν*, taken with its context, clearly implies that the change was effected by means of the divinely-ordained prayer of thanksgiving, which therefore included the words of consecration.

Keeping St. Justin's description in mind, it may be of interest to note, with Dr. Probst, some three or four passages in the New Testament which seem to have reference to this primitive Thankprayer.<sup>1</sup> St. Paul appears to allude to it when he says,<sup>2</sup> "Else if thou bless (*εὐλογήσης*) with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned say the 'Amen' at thy giving of thanks (*ἐπὶ τῇ σὴ εὐχαριστίᾳ*), seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks (*εὐχαριστεῖς*) well, but the other is not edified." If now we turn to 2 Cor. i. 20 (R.V.), we find these words: "For how many soever be the promises of God, in Him (*i.e.*, in Jesus Christ) is the Yea (*i.e.*, the fulfilment); wherefore also through Him is the 'Amen,' unto the glory of God through us;" from which it may be concluded with some probability, that

<sup>1</sup> Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte*, pp. 31, seq.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17, R.V.

"the promises of God" found a place in that Eucharistic prayer to which the faithful answered "Amen." And it is at least possible that a further hint as to the contents of the same prayer may be gathered from Rom. i. 21, 25. For having there said that "the Gentiles, knowing God, glorified Him not as God, neither gave thanks (*ἡὐχαρίστησαν*)," the Apostle goes on to say that "they changed the truth for a lie, worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever, Amen." The sudden introduction of a doxology here seems to suggest that the writer has in his mind a form of prayer; a prayer in which Christians were accustomed to give thanks to God as the Creator. When, then, he goes on in the next chapter to blame the Jews because, as the Gentiles forgot to thank God, their Creator, so they also despised "the goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering" of God, it may be that here, too, there is an allusion to the usual contents of the same portion of the liturgy. We say, "to the usual contents," of the thanksgiving prayer, because there is no evidence whatever that its actual wording had as yet been determined by means of a fixed formula, and the description given by Justin seems to imply, as has been said, that even in his time the prayer was made extempore by the officiating Bishop. If, moreover, we take account of the matters touched upon in the opening sentences of St. John's Gospel and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of the actual succession of the mysteries which form the sequel to the Incarnation, it is easy to see that the great Thanksgiving might naturally contain reference to all or some of the following topics:

- a. The attributes of God.
- b. The Creation.
- c. The mercies of God to the people of Israel.
- d. The Incarnation.
- e. The Teaching of our Lord.
- f. His Passion.
- g. The Institution of the Holy Eucharist.
- h. The Passion again.<sup>1</sup>
- k. The Resurrection and Ascension.
- l. The sending of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> It is not without reason that we suppose the Passion to have been mentioned twice. For although the institution of the Holy Eucharist chronologically preceded the Passion, it was commemorative thereof. Some reference to the Passion might therefore be expected to precede the recital of the words of institution. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23, "in qua nocte tradebatur," and the words "qui pridie quam pateretur" of the Roman liturgy.

And in view of the sacrificial character of the ritual we should expect that, towards the close of the Thankprayer, *i.e.*, after the consecration, there would be found some words expressive of the offering of a spotless Victim to God, and the like. But whether or no every one of these topics were mentioned on each occasion of the solemnization of Mass, such in general would be the line of thought, expressed by means of an unbroken or uninterrupted formula. And it may fairly be regarded as in one respect a matter for regret that, by the interruption introduced by the intercalation of the Tersanctus, the opening portion of the primitive Thankprayer should have been cut off from the rest, and reduced (if we may so say) to the condition of a mere "Preface," however solemn. That there are compensating advantages in the development which actually took place we do not question; but it is at least worth while to recall to mind that, according to the primitive usage, the Thankprayer emphatically did not come to an end, as our Preface does, with the Tersanctus, but was continued onwards so as to include the consecration itself.

But now it may be asked, Are there any other grounds for this assertion, or hypothesis, than the brief description of the liturgy given by St. Justin, combined with *à priori* considerations the force of which not every one, perhaps, will be ready to acknowledge? To this very reasonable question we reply that there are other grounds for the assertion, and grounds which are quite independent of St. Justin's testimony, and of the antecedent probabilities of the case, whatever these may be worth.

Among the various collections of more or less primitive ecclesiastical canons and statutes which have been preserved down to our own day, and the relation of which to one another presents so many problems to the patient industry of critical scholars, there is one to which the title of *Canones Ecclesiastici* has been given by Lagarde, and that of "Church Ordinances" by Mr. Brightman, and of which a word must here be said. The Ordinances (as we shall henceforward call them) are known to exist in their entirety only in the Sahidic and Memphitic dialects of the Coptic language. A late Memphitic text, with an English translation, was edited by Mr. Tattam in 1848.<sup>1</sup> A better Sahidic text was brought to light by Lagarde in 1883,

<sup>1</sup> *The Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles in Coptic, with an English Translation.* By H. Tattam. London, 1848. This work we have not had the opportunity of consulting.



and reprinted in 1896.<sup>1</sup> The Ordinances contain seventy-eight chapters, or statutes, and of these chapters 31–62 may be conveniently regarded as a distinct “book,” readily separable from the rest. This, which for convenience may be called “Book ii.” of the Ordinances, answers to that portion of the well-known Eighth Book of the “Apostolical Constitutions” which deals with the ordination of bishops, priests, deacons, &c., and with the ecclesiastical status of widows, virgins, &c., and which also embodies the so-called Clementine Liturgy. Notwithstanding Professor Funk’s endeavours to prove the contrary, there seems to be no reasonable doubt as to the priority of the Ordinances (Book ii.) as compared with the Constitutions (Book viii.), the latter being in many respects more highly developed.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately the Coptic text of the Ordinances omits almost the whole of the liturgy, which the Constitutions give in full, the earlier collection thereby lacking what is on the whole the most interesting feature of this portion of the Constitutions. But, on the other hand, the discovery of the Coptic Ordinances has revealed the importance of a document which has been in the hands of scholars for more than two hundred years, but of which no one except Bunsen seems to have perceived the real significance. In the year 1691, Job Leutholf brought to light, in the second volume of his *History of the Ethiopic Church*, certain fragments to which he gave the title of *Statuta Apostolorum*, and which turn out to be identical with a portion of the Ordinances, and to contain the liturgy, or rather the Anaphora, or Thankprayer of the liturgy, which—as has been said—the Coptic text omits.<sup>3</sup> It is greatly to the credit of Bunsen that, so long ago as 1843, and therefore before

<sup>1</sup> *Ægyptiaca*, Pauli de Lagarde studio et sumptibus edita. Gottingen, 1883 (reprinted 1896).

<sup>2</sup> In the *Dublin Review*, 1895, p. 568, the present writer somewhat incautiously adopted Dr. Probst’s view that the Clementine Liturgy represents a primitive rite common to all the Churches. But Bishop Lightfoot rightly speaks of it (l.c. p. 388, note) as “already a considerably developed form.” Mr. Brightman’s conclusion is that the Clementine Liturgy is constructed on an Antiochene basis, “worked over and expanded by the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*,” who is, according to Mr. Brightman, no other than the pseudo-Ignatius, i.e., the originator of the interpolated revision of the Ignatian Epistles. (*Eastern Liturgies*, Introd. p. xliii.) The scope of the present article affords no opportunity for dealing with the newly discovered “Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis,” with which Mr. Brightman has so ably dealt in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 18, seq.

<sup>3</sup> Jobi Ludolfi, alias Leutholfi dicti, ad suam *Historiam Æthiopicam antehac editam Commentarius*. Frankfort, 1691. The *Historia Æthiopica*, of which the *Commentarius* may be regarded as a second volume, was published in 1681.



the discovery of the Coptic Ordinances, he pronounced the Anaphora to be the oldest extant form of the kind.<sup>1</sup> And it is strange indeed that not only did Bunsen's opinion apparently fail to attract attention, but even after the discovery of the Coptic Ordinances, no one, until the appearance in 1891 of a learned monograph by Dr. Hans Achelis, seems to have been awakened to the importance of this Ethiopic fragment.<sup>2</sup> Even Mr. Brightman gives it quite subordinate place in his *Eastern Liturgies*, published so lately as 1897.<sup>3</sup> The document is of sufficient importance to be here given in full. For the most part we have followed the translation from the Ethiopic used for Mr. Brightman's book by the Rev. J. C. Ball, but we have ventured on a few slight alterations derived from Leutholf's Latin version, and from the German translation of the Coptic and Ethiopic (by Drs. Steindorf and Bachmann respectively) which may be found in Achelis' monograph.<sup>4</sup> The Coptic text is certainly the older, and has the great advantage of retaining many of the original Greek words and formulæ, as any one may see for himself in the pages of Lagarde's *Ægyptiaca*, or in Achelis.<sup>5</sup> But it is available only down to the close of the preliminary responses. The rubrical directions are here given in italics, and all variants which in any degree affect the sense are noted at the foot of the page.

*And the deacon brings the Oblation to [the newly consecrated Bishop]; and he lays his hand upon the Oblation, with all the presbyters, and giving thanks, (i.e., εὐχαριστῶν), says thus: The Lord be with you all.*

*And all the people shall say: With thy spirit.*<sup>6</sup>

*And he shall say: Lift up your hearts.*<sup>7</sup>

*And all the people shall say: We have them (lifted up) to the Lord.*<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, i. (*Eastern Liturgies*), Introduction, p. lxxv. We do not, however, venture to pronounce, with Bunsen, that the Ethiopic Anaphora, or rather its Greek original, goes back, precisely in its present form, to the second century.

<sup>2</sup> Achelis, *De Älteste Quellen des Orientalischen Kirchenrechtes*. Leipzig, 1891.

<sup>3</sup> Brightman, pp. 189, seq.

<sup>4</sup> Leutholf, ii. 324, seq.; Achelis, pp. 48, seq.

<sup>5</sup> Lagarde, *Ægyptiaca*, p. 249; Achelis, l.c.

<sup>6</sup> So the Coptic. The Ethiopic omits "all," Ball writes "shall answer," but the verb is the same as that used for the Bishop. The response in the Ethiopic is: "May He be wholly with thy spirit."

<sup>7</sup> Ἄνω ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας (Copt.). This is the precise equivalent of our "Sursum corda."

<sup>8</sup> The Coptic omits "all," which the Ethiopic has, though Ball omits to render it. The response (ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον) is, with the change of a single letter (ἔχωμεν for ἔχομεν), precisely our "Habemus ad Dominum." As it stands it would be "Habeamus ad Dominum."

*And he shall say:* Let us give thanks to the Lord.<sup>1</sup>

*And all the people shall say:* (It is) right and just.<sup>2</sup>

*Then they (i.e., the presbyters) say the consecration of the oblation, following the Bishop:*<sup>3</sup>

We give Thee thanks, O Lord, in Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, whom in the last days Thou has sent to us as a Saviour and Redeemer, the messenger [or "Angel," B.] of Thy counsel. He is the Word [that came] from Thee, through whom Thou madest all things by Thy will. And Thou didst send Him from Heaven into the bosom of a ["the," B.] Virgin. He was made Flesh and was borne in her womb. And Thy Son was made known by the Holy Ghost, that He might fulfil Thy will, and that He might prepare Thy people for Thee. Stretching forth His hands He suffered to loose the sufferers that trust in Thee. Who was delivered of His own will to suffering that He might destroy death, and who burst the bonds of Satan and trampled on hell ["Sheol," A. "Hades," B.], and led forth the Saints, and established a covenant ["Statuta conderet," L. "Satzungen begründete," A.] and made known His resurrection. Accordingly ["Therefore," B. "Also," A.] He took bread, gave thanks, and said: Take, eat, this is My Body which is broken for you. And in like manner the cup also and said: This is My Blood, which is shed ["shall be shed," A.] for you; as often as ye do this, ye shall do it in remembrance of Me.

Remembering, therefore, His Death and His Resurrection, we offer Thee this bread and cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast made us meet to stand before Thee and do Thee priestly service. We beseech Thee therefore that Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit on the oblation of this Church. Grant also to all that partake of it that it may be to them unto sanctification, that they may be filled with the Holy Spirit, and that they may be strengthened in true faith, that they may extol and praise Thee in Thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom to Thee be glory and dominion in the holy Church, both now and for ever, and world without end. Amen.

It is surely impossible to compare this simple form of Anaphora with the longer form in the Apostolical Constitutions (the Clementine Liturgy) without feeling convinced that, so far as structure is concerned, the simpler form is the older. All analogy

<sup>1</sup> Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τὸν Κύριον (Copt.), i.e., "Gratias agamus Domino" (omitting "Deo nostro").

<sup>2</sup> Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον (Copt.), i.e., "Dignum et justum (est)."

<sup>3</sup> "The consecration of the oblation." So Ball *apud* Brightman. Leutholf has "orationem Eucharisticam," and Bachmann (*apud* Achelis) "das Eucharistie-Gebet." The whole sentence, as it stands in the Coptic, seems to mean: "Then they shall pray, following him, the prayer (?) which follows, when (i.e., whereby) the offering (προσφορά) is made holy," or "at the making of the holy offering." And in the Ethiopic text the same word is used which above is rendered, by Bachmann, "Opfer" (i.e., προσφορά or oblatio).

points to structural expansion and development rather than to the contrary process as the law of early liturgical evolution. And if we now compare this so-called Ethiopic Anaphora, which is almost certainly a translation from the Greek, with the description of the liturgy given by Justin, we find that it agrees most remarkably with the words of that Father. It is a single prayer, interrupted by no response, until at the end the people answer: "Amen." It is a prayer in which thanks are given to God for that He has "made us meet" (or "deemed us worthy") to stand before Him, and to do Him "priestly service," words which precisely answer to St. Justin's *ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ*. Moreover, as in Justin's description, the Communion follows immediately upon the people's "Amen," so also in the Church Ordinances we find that after the "Amen" at the close of the Anaphora, the people approach to receive "the medicine of their souls, whereby sin is remitted," while a hymn is sung.<sup>1</sup>

We do not, of course, pretend to say that the Anaphora of the Church Ordinances is verbally identical with the Anaphora of Justin's days, for as has been already said, St. Justin's words seem to imply that no fixed formula was yet in use, nor is there the smallest reason for supposing that when the Anaphora came to be written down (whether before or after his time) it would be verbally identical in any two Churches, and except so far as one Church might borrow from another.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it may be freely conceded that the prayer given above hardly, perhaps, answers to Justin's *ἐπὶ πολὺ*, and that longer forms may have been usual at Rome. Indeed, so far as concerns the topics touched upon in the Thankprayer, it seems probable that the Anaphora of the Constitutions gives a better idea of the normal contents of such a prayer than that of the Ethiopic Ordinances. It follows the order of topics suggested above, on p. 134. All that we contend for is the structural identity of the Anaphora of the Ordinances with the Anaphora described

<sup>1</sup> Leutholf, pp. 326, seq.; Brightman, pp. 190, seq.; Achelis, pp. 57, seq. Justin would hardly be expected to mention the three prayers recited by the Bishop in immediate preparation for the Communion. It is possible, however, that even these prayers were introduced after St. Justin's time.

<sup>2</sup> "We cannot indeed be certain from the expression *ὅση δύναμις* itself that Justin is referring to unwritten forms of prayer, for it might express merely the fervency and strength of enunciation. . . . But in connection with its context here, it certainly suggests that the language and thoughts of the prayers were dependent on the person himself." (Lightfoot, *Epistle of St. Clement*, i. 386, note.)

by St. Justin, and we hold that both point unmistakably to a time when the unity of the thanksgiving had not yet been broken by the intercalation of the Tersanctus.

And now a most welcome confirmation of this view has come to light in the so-called *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, which has been brought to light within the last few months by Mgr. Rahmani.<sup>1</sup> In the metropolitan library of the Catholic or Uniat Syrians at Mossul on the Tigris, there is a Syriac MS. which professedly contains "the sacred books of the Old and New Testament that are Holy Scripture," but which in fact includes, besides the canonical Scriptures, eight books of so-called "Ordinances of the Apostles." The contents of Books iii.—viii. are, with considerable differences of arrangement, substantially identical with documents already known and published. But a quite special interest attaches to Books i. and ii., which consist of materials hitherto unknown, though they stand in a specially close relation with Book ii. (or chapters 31—62) of the "Church Ordinances," of which something has already been said. Mgr. Rahmani has unquestionably been well advised in publishing these two books without delay, reserving for a future occasion the publication, if it shall seem desirable, of Books iii.—viii. And even those scholars who find themselves unable to accept all his conclusions, will be thankful for the learned Introduction and Dissertation which accompany the text. The two books in question bear, it may here be noted, the somewhat bizarre title of "The Testament of the Lord, or the words which our Lord, being risen from the dead, addressed to His Apostles," and will be referred to hereafter as "the Testament."<sup>2</sup> Its text has been carefully compared by Mgr. Rahmani with that of the Ordinances, with the result that he considers the Testament to be the older of the two. With this conclusion we do not see our way altogether to agree. It is true that the Testament contains some distinctly archaic features which point to an earlier date than that of the Ordinances; but, on the other hand, the relative prolixity of the Testament, in which respect it occupies an intermediate position between the Ordinances and the Constitutions, at

<sup>1</sup> *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, nunc primum edidit, latine reddidit et illustravit Ignatius Ephraem II. Rahmani, Patriarcha Antiochenus Syrorum. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> "Testamentum Domini, seu verba qua Dominus noster a mortuis resurgens ad Apostolos habuit." (Rahmani, p. 10.)

least suggest that it has been expanded from the former, rather than that the Ordinances should be regarded as an abbreviated recension of the Testament. As Latin is less ancient than Greek, and yet has preserved many traces of the common Aryan stock which the Greek has lost; as Arabic is less ancient than Biblical Hebrew, and yet retains many etymological forms which are more archaic than the corresponding forms in Hebrew, so it seems to us that as a whole the Testament is less primitive than the Ordinances, even though it still exhibits survivals of primitive usage which the Ordinances, as we have them, have dropped.

Confining our attention for the present to the liturgy, and in particular to its central portion, we find that the Testament adds a second to the single instance which had hitherto been known to exist of an Anaphora which is substantially a single prayer throughout. It is simple in structure, like that of the Ordinances, in the sense that its unity is broken by no intercalated Tersanctus; but, on the other hand, its simplicity is not so perfect as that of the Anaphora given by Leutholf. For not merely is it considerably longer—a feature which would not of itself be conclusive—but it contains a rubrical direction, according to which the people are to join with the Bishop in reciting the words, technically called the *Anamnesis* ("Mindful therefore of Thy death and resurrection," &c.), which immediately follow the consecration, or else to respond by repeating the words (or some of them) after him. This would seem to be an innovation on the primitive homogeneity of the prayer. Moreover, the *Anamnesis* itself, with the combined offering and invocation, addressed in the Testament to the three Divine Persons, appears to us to be clearly less primitive than the corresponding form in the Ordinances. That the reader may judge for himself, we place the corresponding portions of the two prayers side by side.

*Ordinances.*

Remembering therefore His death and resurrection, we offer Thee this bread and (this) cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast made me worthy to stand before Thee and do Thee priestly service.

*Testament.*

Remembering therefore Thy death and resurrection, we offer Thee (this) bread and (this) cup, giving thanks to Thee, who art the only God for ever, and our Saviour, because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and do Thee priestly service. Wherefore we Thy

We beseech Thee therefore that Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit on the oblation of this Church. Grant also to all that partake of it that it may be to them unto sanctification, that they may be filled with Thy Holy Spirit, and that they may be strengthened in the faith, &c. (*ut supra*.)

servants give thanks to Thee, O Lord.

*And let the people say likewise.*

*Then (the Bishop) shall say:*

We offer Thee this thanksgiving (? thank-offering), Eternal Trinity, O Lord Jesus Christ, O Lord the Father, from whom are all creatures, and in whom all nature, trembling, seeks refuge, O Lord the Holy Ghost, grant us this cup ("adfer potum hunc," R.) and this food of Thy holiness, (and) grant that they may be to us not unto judgment or unto perdition, but to the healing and strength of our souls. Grant us, O God, that every thought of things that are displeasing to Thee may flee from us, &c.

And here it is of special interest to note that neither of these two very early documents contains any trace of the Epiklesis in its later form, wherein it takes the form of a petition that the Holy Spirit may "make the bread (to become) the Body" of our Lord and the wine to become His Blood. The link between the simple Epiklesis of the Ethiopic Anaphora and the later forms to which we have just referred is supplied by the Constitutions, where the petition runs as follows:

We beseech Thee, that Thou wouldst look favourably upon these gifts lying here before Thee, . . . and that Thou wouldst be well pleased with them to the honour of Thy Christ, and that Thou wouldst send down upon this Sacrifice (*θυσίαν*) Thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the Lord Jesus, that He may show (*δπως ἀποδείξη*) this bread to be the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup to be the Blood of Thy Christ, that those who partake of it may be strengthened unto piety, may receive remission of their sins, &c.<sup>1</sup>

While then we cannot agree with Mgr. Rahmani in regarding the Anaphora of the Testament as the oldest form now extant, it is of the highest interest as confirming conclusions which might have been drawn, with the highest probability, from a comparison of St. Justin's account with the so-called Ethiopic Anaphora of Leutholf. It is of interest, too, as helping to suggest the fashion in which it may probably have come about

<sup>1</sup> Brightman, p. 21.

that the Tersanctus and the Benedictus were subsequently introduced into the earlier portion of the Anaphora, thereby cutting off a portion (viz., the "Preface") from the continuous unity of the whole. In the Testament, after the Amen at the conclusion of the Anaphora, we find the following formulæ:

*The Deacon.* Let us earnestly beseech our Lord and God that He would grant to us to be of one mind in the Spirit ("concordem mentem Spiritus").

*The Bishop.* Grant us to be of one mind in the Holy Spirit, and heal our souls by this oblation, that we may live in Thee for ever and ever.

*The People.* Amen.

*Let the people, praying, repeat the same. This done let the giving of thanks be closed after this manner.*

[*The Bishop.*] May the name of the Lord be blessed for ever.

*The People.* Amen.

*The Priest (sic).* Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, blessed is the name of His glory.

*Let all the people say:* So be it, So be it.

And again it is directed that each of the faithful, after he has received his fragment of the Sacred Host, is to say,

Holy, Holy, Holy Trinity unspeakable, grant me that I may receive this Body unto life and not unto condemnation.

Here it is true we have neither the full Tersanctus nor the full Benedictus of the later liturgies. But the use of such tentative and incomplete formulæ as these would easily pave the way for the introduction of the fuller and more Scriptural invocations with which we are now familiar. And the mention of Angels and Archangels, Cherubim and Seraphim, in that portion of the prayer wherein God is praised for the works of creation, afforded a ready "cue" for the placing of the invocations there rather than at the conclusion of the Anaphora. It may further be noted that in a majority of those liturgies which embody the Tersanctus, with or without the Benedictus, the continuity of the Anaphora is less completely broken than in the Roman and in the present Ambrosian rite. For in all these liturgies, with the exception of the Roman and Ambrosian, the *Post Sanctus* (to adopt a term derived from the early Gallican rite) takes up and develops the leading words of the Tersanctus (or of the Tersanctus and Benedictus), and so carries



on the Anaphora to the consecration.<sup>1</sup> A single instance may be sufficient to illustrate our meaning. In the so-called *Missale Gothicum*, an eighth century document, the *Post Sanctus* for St. Stephen's day runs as follows :

Vere sanctus vere benedictus Dominus noster Jesus Christus unigenitus tuus, qui martyrem suum Stephanum cœlesti aulæ collegio muneravit, qui corporis nostri infirmitatem suscepit, et priusquam pium sanguinem pro humana salute funderet, mysterium sacræ sollemnitatis instituit. Ipse enim pridie, &c.<sup>2</sup>

We can here touch but briefly upon a second change by which the primitive simplicity of the originally continuous Anaphora was broken into, viz., the Mementos of the Living and the Dead, and that of the Saints. These have all, it would seem, grown by a process of natural expansion out of the originally simple formula of oblation which—as exemplified in the Ordinances and in the Testament—occurred towards the close of the Anaphora. The fact that in the various families of liturgies these Mementos hold very different positions relatively to the consecration, would alone suggest that they do not belong to the Anaphora in its original form.

H. L.

<sup>1</sup> The truth of this statement may be verified by reference to Brightman, pp. 19 (the Clementine), 51 (St. James), 86 (Syrian Jacobites), 132 (St. Mark), 176 (Coptic Jacobites), 282 (Abyssinian Jacobites), 284 (Persian Nestorians), 324 (Byzantine), 436 (Armenian); to the Mozarabic Missal (Migne, *P.L.* lxxxv.); and to Neale and Forbes, *The Gallican Liturgies*, passim. See also the *Dublin Review*, January, 1894, pp. 114, 117, seq.

<sup>2</sup> Neale and Forbes, pp. 39, 40; *Dublin Review*, l.c. p. 117.



## *The Work of the Catholic Guardians' Association.*

---

THERE is never a sovereign remedy for a social evil. It must be cured far more—if cure be practicable—by the building up of preventive agencies than by the application of remedial measures. Where it is necessary to pull down with the one hand, it is still more urgent to construct with the other. The old problem of our Catholic "leakage" is a case in point. It is useless to denounce Protestant agencies for kidnapping our destitute children unless we also provide suitable schools and homes of our own for their reception. It is, to say the least of it, a short-sighted policy to spend vast sums every year on the support of our Catholic schools, and then to organize no agencies for keeping hold of our young people when they emerge from school-life. No single measure, however wisely devised, can solve this ever-present difficulty. Holes have to be stopped up in all directions, and it is only by a close net-work of Catholic organizations surrounding our poor, that the melancholy falling away of our Catholic population can be stemmed. In the Westminster diocese the Catholic Social Union is one means to the end, the Rescue Committees, both north and south of the river, on their new and admirable basis, are another, Boys' Brigades offer a third, and yet one more is to be found in a Society whose work I have been in a position of late to study closely, and which has never yet received all the recognition it deserves, the Catholic Guardians' Association.

It is futile to disguise the fact that the Catholic body has lost an incalculable number of children through the action of our Poor Law system in the past, and that we are still losing them year by year. We lost in the past mainly through the bigotry of Boards of Guardians, who declined to give Catholic education to the children of Catholic parents. If we lose to-day, it is mainly through the lack of Catholic Guardians to keep a sufficient watch over the children of their poorer co-religionists.

The law gives us all, or nearly all, that we have the right to demand ; the majority of Boards are prepared to deal fairly by us, and it lies with us to see that the law is carried out both in the letter and the spirit, and that the Catholic inmates of our workhouses and infirmaries are actually in the enjoyment of all the spiritual privileges to which they are entitled. Given a fairly broad-minded Board of Guardians, with due arrangements for the transference of all admittedly Catholic children to our Certified Poor Law Schools, or to cottage or scattered homes under the care of Catholic foster-parents near a Catholic church and schools, I have no hesitation in saying that the children of avowedly Catholic parents run no appreciable risk to their faith in entering the House. The children lost to us are mainly the offspring of mixed marriages and of non-practising Catholics, or deserted children or foundlings. Unhappily the children who come under these various headings are exceedingly numerous, and every individual case requires careful watching—watching which only a Guardian is in a position to give—if its religious education is to be secured. It is amazing the variety of apparently accidental circumstances which may result in baptized Catholic children being entered as Protestants, and once so entered on the Creed Register no alteration can be made save by an infinity of trouble and an appeal to the Local Government Board.

It was a growing realization of the urgent need for more Catholic Guardians to deal with the leakage in this quarter, together with an appreciation of the many knotty questions, both legal and tactical, with which they were called upon to cope, that led, a few years ago, to the foundation of the Catholic Guardians' Association. It has come to us, like many other good things in Catholic social work, from the south side of the river, and is the direct offspring of the Southwark Diocesan Workhouse Association, which was established for the general purpose of brightening the lot of the Catholic inmates of our Poor Law establishments and of undertaking some of those duties which the lack of Catholic Guardians in the diocese caused to be neglected. It was at a Conference of Catholic Guardians summoned by that Association in June, 1895, that the scheme of a new Guardians' Association was definitely brought forward in a paper read by Surgeon-Major McSheehy. That, however, was scarcely the initial step in the movement, for already in the previous October, at the first Conference of

Catholic Guardians ever held at the Cathedral House, Southwark, the need for some such organization began to make itself felt, with the result that early in the following spring a deputation waited upon the late Bishop Butt to ask his advice and co-operation in extending the work throughout the country. Thus the way was paved for Dr. McSheehy's proposal, which met with a most favourable reception at the Conference, a provisional Committee being appointed forthwith to make the necessary arrangements. Within a few months His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan had accepted the office of President, while all the Bishops of England, together with the Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Ripon, allowed their names to figure as patrons of the new Association. From that time forward the history of the Society has been one of steady progress and of useful work carried on over an ever-widening sphere of activity.

The Association is, in the main, a consultative body. Its primary function is to supply advice and information to all who apply for it on any point concerned with the welfare of the Catholic inmates of our Poor Law institutions. It has had from the first the advantage of the legal wisdom of Mr. W. C. Maude and the late Mr. B. F. C. Costelloe, who have acted as Hon. Counsel—the place of the latter being now taken by Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Q.C.—and of Mr. S. Ward, who fills the important post of Hon. Solicitor. The executive committee, consisting of men and women experienced in Poor Law matters, meets once a month at Archbishop's House to consider difficult cases that have been referred to the Hon. Secretary, and to direct the general lines of activity of the Association. But it will produce no heart-burning among members, however active they may be, if I state that the real strength of the Association is to be found in the person of our Hon. Secretary, Mr. T. G. King. Without Mr. King the Association would never have seen the light; without his inexhaustible zeal, his thorough knowledge of the Poor Law, and his prudent tactics in dealing with adversaries, it could never have attained to its present importance. He is in touch, on the one hand, with the authorities of the Local Government Board, and, on the other, with every isolated Catholic Guardian throughout the country who cares to apply to him, or to pay the minimum subscription to the Society of two shillings and sixpence per annum. He has at his fingers' ends all the intricacies of the law in regard to the education and guardianship of children, and is acquainted with all the recent decisions

of the courts of law on questions affecting Catholic interests. All of us who have had practical experience in our work as Guardians of Mr. King's advice, of his wide knowledge of useful precedents, of the promptness and courtesy with which he replies to his correspondents, are aware that whatever success we may have enjoyed on our respective Boards in dealing with these really perplexing matters, is due in no small measure to him. For many years now he has made the subject his own, and I have no hesitation in saying that there is no Catholic living to whom the Catholic inmates of our Poor Law institutions owe so much.

The second important work of the Guardians' Association is the organization of an annual Conference of Catholic Guardians. Poor-law conferences, attended by delegates from associated unions, are frequently held all over the country—women-Guardians, too, have their own special little conferences at Westminster—and the utility of such gatherings is so well established, that it seems hardly necessary to explain the *raison d'être* of our Catholic meetings. These are usually held in the summer either at Archbishop's House or at the Cathedral House, Southwark. It would be idle to pretend that they have been attended as fully as their organizers would wish, yet year by year they have shown, if not a large increase of numbers, an unmistakable growth in interest and in the practical nature of the discussions. It is the one occasion on which Catholic Guardians can meet each other in friendly consultation, and discuss the various problems presented from a frankly Catholic standpoint, and I would strongly urge them not to miss the opportunity. For myself I can honestly say, that I have found the meetings exceedingly instructive and encouraging, and fully worth the necessary sacrifice of time. Excellent papers have been read at them, on such important subjects as the legal rights of our Catholic poor, the position of our certified schools compared with so-called "barrack" schools, the *pros* and *cons* of the "scattered home" system, emigration, Catholic girls and the M.A.B.Y.S., and so on. All these papers, together with an abstract of the discussions, are published in pamphlet form with the annual report of the Society, and will be found most useful for reference purposes. One year the Rev. Dr. Barry kindly consented to give an address to the members, on the spirit in which they should labour at their apostolate of mercy. The ideal he preached was an exceedingly

high one, but, in its practical aspects, it was in close harmony with the spirit which has always animated the promoters of the Association. For although it exists for the express purpose of forwarding Catholic interests in Poor Law matters, it is pleasant to be able to say that it has never taken a narrow or controversial view of the duties of a Catholic Guardian. It has preached from the first the necessary truth that Guardians must be citizens of the State as well as members of the Church, that they must take their full share in the general work of their Board, if they wish their opinions to be of weight where their own interests are concerned. In past years, when the whole subject was far less thoroughly understood than it is at present, a certain number of Catholic Guardians in different parts of the country imagined they were doing their duty when they were restricting their share in the work of their respective Boards to matters of directly Catholic interest. It may seem needless to point out to-day the futility of such a course, which has been condemned over and over again at the Catholic conferences; but it should not be forgotten that it is due in part to the efforts and the example of the Association that a higher, wiser, and more truly Catholic view has come to prevail.

What we may term the incidental activities of the Association—or perhaps it would be more correct to say of its Hon. Secretary—range over a very wide field. The question of Catholic burial for inmates of our Poor Law institutions has for long attracted its anxious attention, and with the happiest results, many Metropolitan Boards within the last few years having consented to allow Catholics buried at their expense the last rites of their faith. It was, in the first instance, through the representations of the Association, that the Necropolis Company not only set aside a large and convenient piece of ground in their great cemetery at Brookwood for the sole use of Catholics, but at their own expense they have erected a mortuary chapel where Mass can be celebrated and the last rites performed. This is an immense boon to the Catholics of South London, and by an agreement signed only a few weeks ago, the Company voluntarily transferred to the Bishop of Southwark full control over the burials that should take place in their Catholic cemetery. Thus everything that Catholics can desire for the reverent committal to earth of their dead has been secured to them, free of all expense to the ecclesiastical

authorities. Many of the Surrey and Metropolitan Boards of Guardians have in consequence made arrangements for the burial of Catholic inmates at Brookwood.

The cognate subject of the payment of Catholic chaplains—or, to give them their technical title under the English Poor Law, the “religious instructors”—has also been constantly pressed forward, and the more liberal-minded Boards all over the country now realize that services rendered should be adequately remunerated. It is as a rule only where the number of the Catholic inmates is small that difficulties are still put in the way of their receiving religious ministrations. A complete table, giving the number of the Protestant and the Catholic inmates in Irish workhouses, together with the salaries paid to their respective chaplains, which was issued by the Association some time ago, furnishes a useful basis of comparison.

At election-time for the Boards of Guardians the Association is never idle. It compiles lists of Catholic candidates, and addresses questions to non-Catholics as to their attitude on leading Catholic questions, subsequently recommending those whose replies have proved satisfactory, unless there are good reasons for not doing so. When matters affecting the welfare of our poor are before Parliament, Mr. King puts himself in communication, both with the Minister in charge of the measure, and with the Catholic Members of Parliament, in order that Catholic interests may not be overlooked. This was done with signal success last session in connection with two Government measures. A clause was added to the Education Act (1899) empowering the committal of epileptic Catholic children to special Catholic institutions at the expense of the parish authorities, a clause which has already led to arrangements being made for the establishment of two Catholic epileptic homes, for boys and girls respectively. And to the Poor Law Act were added words safeguarding the faith of Catholic children adopted by Boards of Guardians. For long the Association has been aware that so-called adoption has been a fruitful source of leakage in the past, Guardians deliberately handing over Catholic children body and soul to Protestant applicants, in defiance of the rulings of the Local Government Board. The most constant watchfulness is necessary to check this evil, but under the new Act, which, while giving very extended powers to Boards of Guardians in regard to adoption, provides more careful regulations in the matter of supervision and responsibility, it is hoped that it will



no longer be possible to rob Catholic children of their faith with impunity.

One small undertaking I should like to urge on the executive committee of the Association which might with advantage be put in hand immediately after the next Guardians' election. It is the compiling and issuing to all the members of the Association of a complete list of Catholic Guardians for England and Scotland, with the Boards to which they belong. There is a great deal of inter-communication between contiguous unions, and much "passing" of inmates from one union to another. Where, as often occurs, a Guardian has information of Catholic children about to be "passed" from his union to another, or where, for one reason or another, it is desirable to ascertain the attitude of a particular Board on a Catholic question, it would be of the greatest assistance to know at a glance whether a Catholic representative sits on the Board or not. A timely note, giving definite information in cases, say of a mixed marriage, might often prove of the greatest utility. I am convinced from personal observation that so-called "pass-cases" are a fertile source of leakage among children. No information as a rule is forthcoming from the union which sends them, and as they are admitted directly into the House, and do not pass through the ordinary channel of the relieving-officer and the relief-committee, they easily escape the notice of even the most vigilant Guardian. The expense of publishing such a list as I suggest would not be great, and I do not think a portion of the small funds at the disposal of the Society could be better expended than in the triennial publication of a leaflet giving this up-to-date information.

One principle on which the Association has invariably acted has been that of cultivating friendly relations with non-Catholic philanthropic societies. A vast number of children can be rescued in that way, and rescued too without the acrimonious controversy which always leaves bitterness behind on either side. With the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, whose fairness to our Catholic children is proverbial, and with the Children's Aid Society, the Hon. Secretary is in frequent communication concerning children to be rescued and provided for. The M.A.B.Y.S. also is ever ready for friendly co-operation. Among Catholic societies which have shown their appreciation of the work of the Association, a foremost place must be given to the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. In



a memorandum on Catholic organization for children, drawn up in accordance with a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Conference held at Bristol in 1897, every Conference was instructed to place itself in direct communication with the Catholic Guardians' Association, and to refer to it for advice in all cases of children in danger of losing their faith that came under the notice of the Brothers. In this way—though I cannot say to what extent the memorandum has been acted upon—a basis was laid by which the Association could have been put in touch with Catholic workers over a very large area. This has been from the first one of its leading aims. In every parish where Catholic families reside, Catholic interests are sooner or later at stake, and it is essential that some one should be at hand to act on their behalf, or at least to make inquiries and send in trustworthy reports. We have suffered too much in the past from isolated efforts, and the Guardians' Association has done more perhaps than any other Society towards linking together the scattered units of Catholic activity throughout the country. To do his work well a Guardian should be in touch with all the principal philanthropic agencies within his diocese. Workhouses, prisons, reformatories and industrial schools, refuges, rescue-houses, all deal with certain aspects of one and the same great problem, the relief of destitution and the moralization of our vicious and criminal population. There are whole families, every member of which has been at one time of his or her life in one or other of these institutions. Some families never escape from this vortex of crime and poverty and vice; others drift in and out, and their salvation depends largely upon a humane hand being held out to them at critical moments in their lives. Single workers can effect little—we all know how frequently the persons we would help are carried far beyond our reach before our efforts have had time to bear fruit—but if all the Catholic workers in these different spheres were in touch one with another their opportunities for good would be multiplied ten-fold.

In this wide apostolate of mercy the Catholic Guardian seems to me to occupy a central position, with exceptional power, and consequently with exceptional opportunities for beneficent action. Many of us, I am afraid, do not act up to that higher ideal which Dr. Barry so eloquently put before us. We are apt to be too much engrossed in the mere routine of our office, in keeping the administrative machine in running

order, to have our eyes steadily fixed on the wider conception of our duties. But even within the strict limits of his own workhouse, the conscientious Catholic Guardian will probably find ample scope for his tactful energies on behalf of his co-religionists. Let us recall, for an instant, all that Catholics have the right to ask for from Boards of Guardians :

1. A chapel for their exclusive use in workhouse and infirmary.
2. A paid chaplain.
3. Burial with Catholic rites.
4. Catholic education for children.
5. Free visiting of inmates by Sisters or other authorized Catholic visitors.

Some Boards grant one privilege, some another ; very few as yet grant them all. But until every item in this Catholic programme be conceded, there is work for the Catholic Guardian to do. And, although I have stated that bigoted Boards are now happily the exception and not the rule, that is not to say that individual officials may not be guilty of anti-Catholic bigotry, which it is the interest of no one save a Catholic Guardian to check. How is it that in many workhouses there is not a single Catholic officer employed, and in many infirmaries, with large staffs, not a single Catholic nurse? We may be sure that in such cases there is anti-Catholic prejudice somewhere, or some private rule on the subject of attendance at Divine Service, which is entirely contrary to the expressed wishes of the Local Government Board.

Again, it is impossible for Guardians, however well-disposed towards us they may be, to know what we hold to be of importance, when they have no Catholics among them to enlighten them. Very often it is honestly assumed that every thing is being done to which Catholics are entitled, when this is very far from being the case, and curiously enough we sometimes find this conviction shared by Catholics themselves. In a parish I know of, it was thought even by our co-religionists, that Catholic candidates were a mistake, and would only serve to excite local religious controversy, while every essential privilege had already been granted to the Catholic inmates. Yet there was no Catholic chapel at the Infirmary, which had an average of one hundred Catholic patients, and no Catholic burial for any Catholic inmate.

Since the last election, when two Catholics won seats upon the Board, a chapel has been added to the Infirmary, and the question of Catholic burial is now under the friendly consideration of the Board.

The work of serving on Boards of Guardians seems to me to be one which it is the bounden duty of the Catholic laity to perform in the interests of their poorer co-religionists. I do not think it desirable that priests should undertake the duty, save where no competent layman is available; and, indeed, very few priests can afford sufficient time for regular attendance. Yet, on the one hand, we have numerous Boards without a single Catholic representative, and, on the other, the amiable layman writing bewildered letters to the Catholic papers, begging for an outlet for his pious energies. I would suggest to him to turn his attention forthwith to the local workhouse or infirmary. If he cannot become a Guardian, he can, at least, as an authorized visitor, do something to brighten the lives of the inmates. He—or she—can help to organize entertainments, send in weekly bundles of Catholic newspapers, start a Catholic library, or play the harmonium at the Sunday Mass. Pauperism is the curse of England; it is the price the nation has to pay for its vast wealth accumulated in the hands of the few, and its highly-complex industrial system. Responsibility towards those who are at least as much the victims of circumstances over which they have no control as of their own vices and shortcomings, cannot be evaded by the nation at large, and it rests upon each individual among us who may be in a position to devote time and labour to the alleviation of their lot.

VIRGINIA M. CRAWFORD.

### *Wenlock and its Saint.*

---

WHEN Henry VIII. cast down the Cluniac Priory of Wenlock, it meant something more than the dissolution of one of the most ancient houses of Religion in the Marches. For eight centuries it had been the resting-place of a Saint, and for five of them, at least, a shrine of no little fame in that part of the kingdom. All the glory and renown of which Wenlock could boast radiated from the tomb of Milburga, its royal and saintly foundress.

Merewald, sub-King of the West Hecanas (comprising the people of Herefordshire and Salop), was the fourth son of Penda of Mercia. Like his brother Wulfere, successor of Penda, he was a Christian. His wife Ermenberga, great-grand-daughter of Ethelbert and Bertha, bore him three daughters, Milburga, Mildred, and Milgyth; all three became nuns, and are all honoured as saints on February 23, February 20, and January 17 respectively.

Milburga received from her father the grant of the land round about Wenlock, to enable her to found a monastery for virgins. Of this house she was made Abbess, receiving the canonical blessing from St. Theodore of Canterbury. Fuller says of her: "She, quitting all worldly wealth, bestowed her inheritance on the Poor, and answered her name of Milburgh, which (as an Antiquary interpreteth) is *Good*, or *Gracious*, to *Town and City*. Living a Virgin, she built a Monastery in the same place."<sup>1</sup>

The old English historians speak of Milburga's monastery as resplendent with all monastic virtues. The Saint herself is said to have received from God the gift of miracles. As to this, many legends still survive in southern Shropshire. She had lands at Stoke, still known as Stoke St. Milboro',<sup>2</sup> but they were infested by wild geese, which destroyed the crops. At the Saint's

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Worthies of England*, 1660, vol. ii. p. 255.

<sup>2</sup> The Saint's name, Milburga, or Milburge, is locally pronounced Milboro'.

bidding, the birds in question entirely forsook the monastic domain.<sup>1</sup> The son of a king having resolved to make Milburga his bride, determined to carry her off, and made a plan to surprise her on one of her visits to Stoke. Flying towards Wenlock, the Saint stepped across the little River Corve, which was in that particular spot but a narrow stream ; but no sooner had she crossed, than it suddenly became a raging torrent which effectually stayed her pursuers.<sup>2</sup>

Near the church at Stoke, called by her name, is still to be seen " St. Milboro's Well," a clear, never-failing spring. A stain, as of blood, on the stones hard by, is believed to have been left by the Saint, who, having been pursued by her adversaries for two days and two nights, fell fainting from her horse at this spot. The spring is said to have been caused by the horse's hoof striking the rock at its rider's command.<sup>3</sup>

Some country-folk, who were sowing barley in a field near, ran to help St. Milburga on this occasion. Blessing the field, she commanded the barley to spring up. Then she bade the men, when asked by her pursuers if a lady on a white horse had passed, to answer that she had done so when that barley was being sown. The barley ripened at mid-day, and was being reaped in the evening when her enemies appeared. When they became aware of the wonder she had wrought, "they owned that it was vain to fight against God," and desisted from pursuit.<sup>4</sup>

"Owing to this story," says Hare, "St. Milburga's day is February 23, at the time of 'lent-tillin', or wheat-sowing, and not on June 25, the day of the Saint's death, which causes 'Millborough Wake' to be held on the last Sunday in June."<sup>5</sup> It is worthy of note that Capgrave, though the Bollandists take exception to it,<sup>6</sup> fixes the date of the Saint's death at June 25 ; the traditional "wake" is a strong proof in favour of that day.

After a long and holy life, St. Milburga's time for departure drew near. Summoning her community, she desired the Sisters to elect the one of their number most fitted to succeed her as Abbess, and exhorted them to keep always in mind those passages of Holy Writ : "Blessed are the clean of heart, for

<sup>1</sup> *Acta SS. Bolland.* vol. vi. p. 396. A similar miracle is narrated of St. Milburga's cousin, St. Wereburga.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Another well of the Saint exists in Much Wenlock ; a conduit from it supplied a fountain in the Priory grounds.

<sup>4</sup> Burne, *Shropshire Folklore*, quoted in Hare's *Shropshire*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> *Shropshire*, p. 45. By Aug. J. C. Hare.

<sup>6</sup> *Acta SS.* vol. vi. p. 396.

they shall see God," and "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Then, fortified with the Sacraments, she expired, and was buried "near the altar, in the church of her monastery at Wenlock."<sup>1</sup>

The monastery of St. Milburga was utterly destroyed during the terrible ravages of the Danes, and the place remained desolate for well-nigh three centuries. At length, in 1017, Leofric, Earl of Mercia, at the instigation of his pious consort, the historic Lady Godiva, began its restoration. The armorial bearings of his successors—three golden wheatsheaves on an azure field,<sup>2</sup> became those of the monastery in after-years. It is a striking coincidence that Wenlock stands in the particular part of Shropshire known in local parlance as "Wheatland." Leofric does not appear to have completed the work begun; for Roger de Montgomerie, first Norman Earl of Shrewsbury, rebuilt it in 1080, peopling the monastery with Cluniac monks brought from the celebrated French house of La Charité.

During the centuries of its devastation, Wenlock had so entirely been lost sight of, that the tomb of St. Milburga was utterly forgotten. Capgrave<sup>3</sup> says that a certain Raymund had discovered a document written by Alstan, a priest, testifying that the body of the holy virgin lay near the altar of the church; but where the altar had actually stood it was impossible to determine. During the progress of the new buildings, two boys were at play together, when one of them slipped and fell. In his fall he broke a hole in the dilapidated pavement, and the tomb of the Saint was disclosed. Her remains, sending forth "a most odoriferous vapour, as of a most precious Balsam," were translated to a shrine of becoming honour. "And such a world of Miracles were wrought by her intercession," continues the chronicler, "that wonderful multitudes flocked thither, both rich and poor, insomuch as there was scarce room in the open fields to receive them, so strong a faith had they to find remedy there for their maladies."<sup>4</sup>

The body is said to have been found in perfect preservation. This, however, is too much for Fuller, as a good Protestant, to accept. "Four hundred years after," he says, in his quaint diction, "in the Reign of William the Conqueror, her Corps

<sup>1</sup> Challoner, *Britannia Sancta*, vol. i. p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> *Az. 3 garbs or.* <sup>3</sup> Bollandists, vol. vi. loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup> *William of Malmesbury*, translated by Dom Cressy, *Church History*, bk. xvii. c. xviii.

(discovered by Miracles wrought thereby) was taken up *sound and uncorrupted*, to the admiration of the beholders: and surely, had I seen the same, I would have contributed my share of wondring thereunto. This I am sure of, that as good a Saint, Lazarus by name, by the confession of his own Sister, did stink when but four dayes buried.<sup>1</sup> Her Relics, enshrined at Wenlock, remained there in great state, till routed in the Reign of King Henry the Eighth."<sup>2</sup>

The church which enshrined these precious remains must have been worthy of the Saint. It stood to the south of the present town of Much Wenlock,<sup>3</sup> near the parish church of the Holy Trinity. Its west front, of which little now remains, is conjectured to have been very like that of Salisbury Cathedral. Its ground-plan was cruciform; though the head of the cross was of equal length with the stem. It was about four hundred feet in extreme length; nave and choir each measured one hundred and fifty-six feet. Its style varied in the different portions; the nave and transepts seem to have been Early Pointed, of about the end of the twelfth century; the choir had massive semi-circular arches of an earlier date; the Lady Chapel, beyond, was built in the fifteenth century. There must have been a central tower, or spire, but probably there were no western towers. From the existing remains it is evident that the church had many features of striking beauty. Over the arches of both nave and transepts—for the latter were also constructed with eastern and western aisles—ran a triforium of graceful pointed arches; two arches in each bay. From a bracket above the spandril of each of the great arches sprang a slender clustered pilaster, which supported the ribs of the vaulted roof.

The conventual buildings stood on the south of the church. The Chapter House, the most striking portion of the fragments still remaining, was a lofty hall with groined roof, measuring sixty feet by thirty. It seems to be older than any other part of the buildings. Its chief feature at the present day is a very beautiful mural decoration of much ornamented interlaced Norman arcading in three tiers, which seems to have covered

<sup>1</sup> The worthy Fuller is here not strictly accurate in his reference; St. Martha merely expressed her fear that corruption might possibly have set in. *Vide* St. John xi. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller, *History of the Worthies of England*, vol. ii. p. 255.

<sup>3</sup> Little Wenlock constitutes a separate parish four or five miles to the north.



the whole of the wall surface.<sup>1</sup> Besides the cloister garth, round which the Refectory and other buildings stood, there was a smaller quadrangle to the south-east. The Prior's House, which formed one side of this latter square, is still entire. It is a fine two-storied building of the latter part of the fifteenth century, and affords one of the best examples of a double cloister—one corridor running over the other. This feature extends along the entire length of the building, and is lighted by more than thirty small windows, combined by mullions and transoms so as to give the appearance of a series of large windows placed in juxtaposition.<sup>2</sup> This building is used as a dwelling-house by the part-proprietor of Wenlock. The various apartments appropriate to a monastic superior may still be traced in the interior; among them is a small oratory with a stone altar. Traces of mural paintings in some of the rooms were discernible early in this century; among them the figure of St. George is said to have been clearly recognized.<sup>3</sup>

From the time of the finding of the body of St. Milburga, Wenlock became one of the favourite shrines of the western counties. William of Malmesbury<sup>4</sup> tells of the crowds who flocked thither to obtain relief from various ailments, none of whom, he says, "departed away without a cure, or at least a mitigation of their diseases. And particularly the Kings-Evill, incurable by Physicians, was through the merits of the Holy Virgin, healed perfectly in severall persons."<sup>5</sup>

The monastery never attained to abbatial rank, in spite of the popular title of "The Abbey," in use in the locality. Up to the reign of Richard II. it continued to be subject to La Charité, and to this fact we are indebted for the scanty gleanings of its history which have been preserved in the records of the Canonical Visitations made from time to time by representatives of the mother-house.<sup>6</sup>

These records, as a rule, speak in high praise of the monastic observance at Wenlock. In 1262, for example, the Visitors

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Britton, *Architec. Antiq.* vol. iv. p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Domestic Architecture of Middle Ages*, Parker, vol. iii. pp. 145, 366.

<sup>3</sup> Britton, *Architec. Antiq.* loc. cit. Mr. Henry James, in his *Portraits of Places*, displays a too vivid imagination in his description of this house. He speaks of "flags worn away by monkish sandals," though Benedictines wore shoes, and of "a ghost, a grey friar, who is seen in the dusky hours," &c. *Vide* Hare, *Shropshire*, p. 291 (note).

<sup>4</sup> *De gestis reg.* lib. ii. c. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Translation by Dom Cressy, *Church History*, loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup> *Visitations of English Cluniac Foundations.* By Sir G. F. Duckett, *passim*.

declared that the Divine Office was carried out with all possible solemnity and propriety; that silence was observed and breaches of rule properly corrected. At that period the monks numbered thirty-four. In 1276, there were forty monks and three lay-brethren. In 1279, the community had decreased by five, but the discipline is praised, although the Prior is blamed for reprehensible conduct in certain money transactions. Later on, a visitation-report states that there were forty monks, that out of the seven daily Masses, three were celebrated with chant; that alms were daily distributed to the poor, and all the statutes prescribed by rule diligently observed.

Early in Stephen's reign, Gervase Paganel resolved to found a priory at Dudley, and "placed his deed of gift with his own hand upon the altar of St. Milburga of Wenlock, in presence of all the convent of that place, to whose protection he committed the new foundation."<sup>1</sup> Dudley continued to be a subordinate cell to Wenlock till the Reformation. In a visitation-report<sup>2</sup> of the various English Cluniac houses, it is stated that this priory had four monks, and celebrated every day two Masses, one being sung.

It was from Wenlock that Walter Fitz-Alan, a native of Salop, brought the first community for his abbey at Paisley, in 1164. The monks expressed their love for their saintly patroness by adding St. Milburga's name to the other titular saints of the new foundation.

In 1394, the monks of Wenlock, to put a stop to the repeated seizure of their house as an "alien priory" during the wars with France, purchased its freedom from Richard II.<sup>3</sup> Wenlock was henceforth regarded as *prioratus indigena*, the monks binding themselves to celebrate an annual *requiem* and *dirge* for that King and his Queen on their anniversaries.

It may easily be imagined that the Prior of so important a monastery held a prominent position in the county of Salop. The priory had succeeded to the possessions of St. Milburga's foundation, and these had been augmented by later donations till its revenues at the period of the Reformation were above £4,000 annually, of present money value. Seventeen parishes, scattered over the county, comprised the "Franchise of Wenlock,"

<sup>1</sup> Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. v. p. 84 (Edit. 1823).

<sup>2</sup> Duckett, *Visitations of English Cluniacs*, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> This King was, curiously enough, a lineal descendant of Roger de Montgomerie,

or "Land of St. Milburga." The Franchise returned a Member to Parliament in 1478, and the present division of Wenlock, which is practically identical with it, enjoyed the same privilege till 1885. The names of some of these parishes witness to their monastic origin; Ditton Priors, for example, and Monkhopton; while Stoke St. Milboro' still retains its ancient title. Oxenbold was one of the summer residences of the priors. An old thirteenth century chapel still remains, and also the ancient "hall," which, however, has been modernized. Many such residences were scattered over the Franchise.

When Wenlock Priory, together with other English monasteries, was suppressed at the Reformation, the twelve monks were pensioned off. The Prior, John Cressage, received at the surrender in 1539, the manor-house of Madeley as a residence, and an income of £80 per annum. Here he died in 1553, and was buried in Madeley Church. The manor had already been sold by Henry VIII. to Robert Brooke ten years before. The priory was granted to "Augustino de Augustinis,"<sup>1</sup> who, as it has been conjectured, was one of the King's foreign physicians. He sold it to Thomas Lawley, in whose family it remained till the son of his great-grand-daughter sold it to the family of Gage. Viscount Gage disposed of it to Sir John Wynn of Wynnstay, who left it, with the rest of his property, to his kinsman, Sir Watkin Williams, who added Wynn to his surname. From the family of Williams-Wynn it passed to that of the present proprietor, Mr. Milnes-Gaskell. The constant change of owners serves as a commentary on Spelman.

A letter of Sir Richard Riche to John Scudamore<sup>2</sup> shows that "the five bellis remayning at the late monasterie of Wenlocke" were sold to James Lewson. He was required to pay for them to the King's Majesty "a lyke waight of belle mettell . . . or elis for the performance thereof to pay after xxs. the hundreth waight thereof."

What became of the sacred remains of St. Milburga has never been ascertained; they probably met the same fate as so many other holy relics in those days of plunder and sacrilege. It may be of interest to clients of the Saint to know that a picture of her, probably dating from the middle ages, is still preserved at Oscott. It forms one of a series representing the female members of the royal line of England who have

<sup>1</sup> Tanner, *Notitia*, Shropshire.

<sup>2</sup> Camden Society, *Suppression of Monasteries*, p. 278.

embraced monastic life. The portraits, which formerly belonged to Sion Abbey, were presented to the College by the last Catholic Earl of Shrewsbury.

As to the church and monastery of Wenlock, they were speedily ruined by the wholesale carting away of stones to serve as building materials. The result is that portions of the sacred fabric may be discerned in various buildings all over the district. In this barbarous way was brought to desolation a church so beautiful that for a time it was debated whether Wenlock Priory should not be made the Cathedral for Salop.<sup>1</sup>

That the sacred ruins are zealously guarded from further devastation, and cherished with loving appreciation by their present possessors, must tend to soften the keenness of the regret which cannot but fill the heart of a Catholic at the contemplation of a spot so redolent of holy memories.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O.S.B.

<sup>1</sup> Hare, *Shropshire*, p. 291.

## *The Catholic Hero of Samoa.*

---

FEW men have endured such vicissitudes of fortune as the white-haired hero who to-day, in spite of himself, is both *de facto* and *de jure* King of Samoa; and I have never heard or read of one who has accepted triumphs and reverses with calmer dignity or more sublime resignation.

A figure of commanding stature, though not tall according to the average standard of his countrymen; still erect as a shaft, in spite of years and many sorrows; a powerful frame, clad in linen of spotless purity, without badge or ornament save a rosary and holy symbol; a serene and kindly countenance, almost untouched by the furrows of age, though hair and moustache are more white than grey; tranquil, deep-set eyes, and lips parted with a bright and genial smile—such were my earliest impressions of Mataafa, as, with rapid but dignified step and hands outstretched in welcome, he, the thrice elected monarch of Samoa, advanced from the guest-house of Falefa, and, in the name of all who loved him, bade me a hearty “Talofa.”

Although we now met for the first time, it was not quite as strangers. For many years I had been accustomed to esteem Mataafa the greatest man of his race, a hero frequently misunderstood, often most cruelly treated; while he had recently learned from relatives of the dead but always remembered Tusitala,<sup>1</sup> that there was coming from far off Peritania (England) one who desired to know and make known the whole truth regarding Samoa. My interest in the subject was not of sudden birth, for long before it fell to my lot to visit the islands, circumstances had enabled me to learn much, from undoubted authority, concerning men and manners in them. More recently, on several occasions anterior to the revolt which followed Mr. Chambers' decision *re* the kingship, I had sought to impress upon the public the gravity of the Samoan problem, and the many dangers to international peace lurking about it; and now

<sup>1</sup> “Story-teller”—the name conferred upon Robert Louis Stevenson, in accordance with native custom, and by which he is best known in Samoa.

I found myself in the islands the representative (or, as the natives put it, *e tusia tala*) "of the great newspaper of England"—*mo le Nuisipepa Peretania tele*. In Apia the majority of my informants concerning late events were officials, and that section of the natives whom they honoured (?) with the title "friendlies;" at Falefa, however, I was to hear the same story, but from another, the "rebel" standpoint.

Only a few weeks before, Mataafa had welcomed to the islands the Joint Commissioners representing Great Britain, Germany, and the United States, and the harbingers, as he hoped, of peace to his much-loved country. "Listening to them as to a voice from Heaven"—as he explained to me in a later interview—he had cast aside every consideration of self, accepted in advance whatever decision they might arrive at regarding the kingship, and, without a thought reserved, had exerted the great influence he possessed over his people to cause them to disarm, return to their villages, and abandon all idea of revenge for ills recently sustained. At dawn, on the third day after the surrender of arms, he himself left Malie, which is situate a short distance to the west of Apia and Mulinu'u, and—rowing far beyond the reef, so that no opportunity might arise for conflict between his followers and the adherents of Tanu and Tamasese—had journeyed to Aliepata, the eastern extremity of the island. Thence he had not moved until now—rightly anticipating that a long absence from Apia at this time might prove inconvenient to me—he had arranged a nearer and more accessible rendezvous. Before this visit came to a conclusion, and in later days, I enjoyed many opportunities for close study of Mataafa's character; and I learned that the thoughtful consideration for others shown in the incident referred to was truly typical of his public and private life.

In the last chapter of his *Footnote to History*, written in 1892, Stevenson paints an admirable picture of the Mataafa of his time, and of the "striking sense of order, tranquillity, and native plenty" which breathed about all his surroundings. The portrait is as true to-day as it doubtless was when originally limned, and the only modification which I suggest is a softening of the colours descriptive of Mataafa's relations with his followers. "In his immediate circle," wrote Stevenson, "he is said to be more respected than beloved, and his influence is the child rather of authority than popularity." It may be that Mataafa's ways are smoother now that his many misfortunes and sacrifices since 1892 have drawn the hearts of his people closer to him;

but it seemed to me, when staying at Aliepata last year, soon after Mataafa's recovery from an illness which threatened to have a fatal result, that the love of the Samoans for him could only be likened to that of a son for a justly venerated parent. It happened that my visit coincided with that of the thirteen chiefs forming Mataafa's Government of January-March, who now assembled for the double purpose of congratulating their leader upon his restoration to health, and of assuring him of the continued fealty of themselves and people. Hoping thus to convince the authorities that no conspiracy was in progress—despite the diligent asseverations of certain whites in Apia—Mataafa and his chiefs with one accord sought the presence at all their meetings of my companions and myself. I can recall from personal experiences no more touching episode than the final farewells of the high chief and his trusted lieutenants, who had served him long and faithfully, and were perhaps truer to him now in adversity than when he was at the zenith of his power. There was no evidence of authority on the one hand, of abasement on the other—only confidence on the part of Mataafa, profound loyalty and affection in every look and gesture of his followers—and many of these latter seemed even older than their chief.

The people of Samoa have little or no idea of reckoning time, and almost every event in their lives is chronologically fixed by reference to a previous war. To ask a man or a child, "How old are you?" is equivalent to propounding an amusing, unsolvable problem. Stevenson wrote of Mataafa as "sixty years of age;" seven years later I sought information on the same subject, and Mataafa, with a smile, said that he thought he must be sixty. Even the older Marist Fathers, some of whom have lived in Samoa almost half a century, were puzzled with the question—to talk of the age of a Samoan seemed to them something extraordinary. Certainly, by his short-lived people, Mataafa is esteemed a veritable patriarch, and I have frequently heard him referred to as "the old man" in much the same way as devoted English Liberals were wont to speak of Mr. Gladstone. Touching Mataafa's age, this much at least is certain—that already in the early seventies, when President Grant was tempting the United States to abandon the traditional policy of the Republic, and found a "sphere of influence" in the Western Pacific, the subject of this sketch was among the foremost leaders of his people.

In the report upon Samoa, which Colonel Steinberger,



the special agent of the United States, brought to Washington in 1873, I find frequent mention of Mataafa as a "great chief," a devoted Catholic, and the ruling spirit of Atua, the eastern district of the island of Upolu. Mataafa, however, does not appear to have played any conspicuous rôle in connection with the reception of Steinberger, his subsequent appearance at the head of a native government, and his dramatic exit from the islands. For this, two explanations can be offered. The American adventurer's earliest patrons, and eventually his most vindictive foes, were the white agents in Samoa of the London and Wesleyan Missionary Societies, between whom and Mataafa no political alliance was ever possible. Again, Mataafa was clear-sighted enough to foresee that, however advantageous to Samoa American protection might be, it would remain but a short while unchallenged by the subjects of England and Germany, and that the chief sufferers in the inevitable reign of intrigue and violence would be the Samoans themselves. Therefore he held himself, and those of his people over whom he could exercise direct control, as aloof as possible from the constitution-mongering, pseudo-religious, and usually self-seeking politicians of Apia and Mulinu'u. Remaining for the most part in Atua, he devoted his great energies to the peaceful development of that province, went but seldom to the seat of government, and remained a passive, but always interested spectator of the remarkable series of events which, as Steyenson concisely put it, "spattered the credit alike of England and the States." In his dignified retreat, Mataafa heard of Steinberger's sale of himself for money to the German firm; of the Premier's kidnapping and deportation (on the requisition of an American consul) by the captain of a British man-of-war; of "our own misconceived little massacre at Mulinu'u;" of the home Governments' condemnation of both consul and naval commander; of the boycott of the consul's successor by the Apia whites and his flight to and life among the friendly natives; of the example of law and order provided for the latter by white lynchers (one of whom was destined to represent H.B.M. in a consular capacity); and of Sir Arthur Gordon's first and not most satisfactory appearance in the troubled seas of Samoan politics. As an inheritance of those days, and because he honourably refused to use his influence on one side or the other, it has frequently been Mataafa's fate to be represented by those who know little or nothing of his history as inimical to all whites, and especially

the Protestant Missions. Though, as it happens, both charges are malicious and false, it would be small wonder if each were justified.

For a brief while, in 1881, Mataafa was compelled to take that position among his countrymen to which he was entitled by birth and influence. Though the unfortunate Malietoa Laupepa had been seated but few months on what by courtesy was called the throne of Samoa, the people had already sickened of his puppet rule and docile submission to every demand of foreign intriguers. Representatives of Aana and Atua met in joint parliament, and elected the two most powerful chiefs of the Tupua family, Tamasese and Mataafa (the latter a very unwilling candidate), to an alternate monarchy—Tamasese to exercise rule during the first two years. The consuls, however, intervened, and as two of their number fondly hoped, settled the matter by making Tamasese vice-king under Malietoa. This arrangement, of course, pleased only the Germans, who promptly set to work to suborn Tamasese and convert him into a pliant instrument of their will. Mataafa busied himself meanwhile with the affairs of his own district, and quietly prepared his people for the life and death struggle which he saw approaching. Before many years had passed, Germany avowed herself the enemy of Samoan independence. Emboldened by the presence of many warships, her representatives recognized Tamasese as king, placed over him as mentor an ex-officer of the Bavarian army, and called upon the hapless Laupepa—who was accused with fine excess of rhetoric of “trampling upon the German Emperor,” to submit unconditionally to their mercy. Laupepa, it must be confessed, faced his troubles with Roman dignity. To the consuls of Great Britain and the United States he bade adieu with words of incisive reproach, reminding them of repeated promises of protection and support if he abstained from opposing Tamasese and his patrons, and expressing hope that they would so far redeem their fair words “as to cause the lives and liberties of my people to be respected.” Then he surrendered himself to the “invincible strangers,” and on the ss. *Bismarck* penned a truly pathetic farewell to Samoa.

Laupepa, though generally unfitted to play the rôle of hero, was able to appreciate great qualities in another. While yet a fugitive he wrote to Mataafa: “I am alone in the bush; if you do not come quickly, you will find me bound.” Thereupon Mataafa set forth from Falefa, first to Tamasese and then to the German commodore, and besought each, for the sake of Samoa

and his own honour, to consider well what he was doing. A month later, as Laupepa was coming down to Apia, intent on his great sacrifice, he was met by Mataafa, and in a little house at the back of the town, the departing King, who was looking forward to a life of exile and perhaps to death, bequeathed to the noblest of his race the care of Samoa and her people. For a while the astute high chief remained apparently neglectful of his trust; he recognized that Brandeis was at heart a friend to Samoa and should be left undisturbed until it was clear that his good intentions were likely to be frustrated by the vagaries of Tamasese and the thinly-veiled threats of German annexation. Soon, however, he was compelled to move, for the people, incensed beyond restraint by Tamasese's usurpation of the name "Malietoa," rose almost to a man and with a single voice called upon Mataafa to be their leader.

At Faleula, on September 9th, 1888, twelve months after Laupepa's deportation, and when it appeared more than doubtful whether he would ever return, Mataafa, under the name of Malietoa To'oa Mataafa, was crowned King of Samoa; and three days later, on Matautu point, the eastern horn of Apia bay, his adherents gained a signal victory over the Tamasese faction. The latter eventually entrenched themselves on the heights above Lotoanuu, where they were besieged by the conquering Mataafans, and it was partly to relieve the pressure upon the beleaguered force and partly to protect the plantations of Vailele, that the German naval commander authorized the fateful enterprise which stands out in history as the only defeat sustained by the arms of Germany since the great conflict of 1870-1. Mataafa, however, knew nothing of the affair until the battle had been fought and won; and he received the news with sorrow rather than exultation, for it has always been his policy to avoid conflict with the whites, and he regards with detestation the practice of mutilating the conquered dead.<sup>1</sup> But by the British and Americans in Apia, who had been much impressed by Mataafa's moderation and control of his people when the town lay at his mercy after the battle of Matautu, the victory was hailed with undisguised satisfaction. Three months later occurred the great hurricane

<sup>1</sup> It is generally admitted by Germans who took part in the fight at Fangalii that, when the party landed, they were mistaken for Tamasese people, and that it was only after daylight appeared and the firing had continued some time that the Samoans recognized their error. Mataafa, it should be also remembered, was far from Vailele on April 1st last, and has more than once expressed sincere sorrow for the losses sustained by the expeditionary force.

which wrecked the German and American squadrons and brought the Samoan question more prominently before the world than it had ever been before. The glorious escape of the *Calliope* will live long in history, as it very deservedly should; but other, not less heroic, incidents have already faded from the public memory. The natives showed that they were not deficient in qualities held in the highest esteem among civilized peoples, for, ignoring the fact that half of those who were battling with the waves were yet threatening Samoan lives and liberties, they devoted themselves with equal zeal and courage to the rescue of Germans and Americans. Moreover, when the harvest of the beach came to be reaped, they astonished all men by exhibiting a virtue, that of rigid honesty, the possession of which had often been denied them. Mataafa, it may be added, still treasures the watch presented to him by the United States Government in recognition of his services on that occasion.

After the battle of Fangalii, Tamasese's following dwindled almost to a shadow. Mataafa established a government at Mulinu'u, and, ignoring as far as possible foreign intrigues and rivalries, succeeded in a remarkable degree in re-uniting the Samoans and fostering the peaceful development of the islands. In November, 1889, however, the exiled Laupepa was restored to Samoa—king by the will of the Treaty Powers, but against his own inclination, and assuredly that of his people. He found Mataafa the idol of the nation, and an object of respect to the foreigners, even to the Germans, whose Government had by an ingenious fraud deprived him of the throne. Quite early in the proceedings of the Conference of Berlin, the plenipotentiaries decided that the Samoans were an independent people and should enjoy the right of selecting their own ruler. At the fifth session, however, Count Bismarck intervened with the statement that though Germany accepted that principle,

he was bound to make one exception in the person of Mataafa, on account of the outrages committed by his people, and under his authority, upon dead and wounded German sailors lying on the field of action.

The Conference accordingly agreed upon a compromise, which, after the manner of most compromises, was ludicrously illogical. In the first article of the Berlin Act, which summed up the united wisdom of the Powers, the latter acknowledged "the free right of the natives to elect their chief or king and choose their form of government;" then they suspended this

"free right" by declaring that, in view of the difficulties which would surround an election in the, at that time, confused condition of the islands,<sup>1</sup> Malietoa Laupepa should again be recognized as king; and finally, by a side wind, they sought to reconvey it by proclaiming that "his (Laupepa's) successors shall be duly elected according to the laws and customs of Samoa." The natives resented the trickery which was the base of these specious sentences, and to its discovery may be attributed the disfavour, always latent, often openly declared, with which the Act was hereafter regarded. Malietoa was himself quick to recognize the sentiments of his people. At Vaiala, on October 22nd, but a fortnight after his return from exile, he formally and publicly renounced all claim to the throne, and at the same meeting Mataafa for the second time was elected king. But the Powers (or should I say Germany?) had willed it otherwise—their consuls arranged a mock election and insisted that Laupepa should resume the sovereignty. Then for nearly two years was witnessed the strange spectacle of a King of Samoa without following or shadow of authority, co-eval with a subject who held an unrivalled position in the eyes and hearts of his countrymen. Such a state of things could not long endure, especially in Samoa, where there was never rest from foreign intrigue. Mataafa, unable to curb the impatience of his more impetuous followers, unwisely gave countenance to acts which amounted to constructive revolt, whereupon Malietoa summoned to his aid the warships, and proclaimed him outlaw. The campaign which followed was short, sharp, and decisive. Mataafa's warriors were completely routed, and he himself fled by boat to Monono, pursued by the British and German warships. On the following morning, July 18th, 1893, he surrendered himself to Captain Bickford, of H.M.S. *Katoomba*, but not before he had secured a promise that the lives of his adherents should be spared, and the property of the unoffending people of Monono unharmed. The first condition was held sacred, but the second, to the sorrow of the humane British captain, was shamefully disregarded.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stevenson describes this reason as "ludicrously false," and adds: "In May, 1889, when Sir Edward Malet moved the matter in the Conference, the election of Mataafa was not only certain to have been peaceful, it could not have been opposed."

<sup>2</sup> Former U.S. Consul-General, J. H. Mulligan, has written thus concerning this breach of faith: "The ships were ready to put back to Apia with the prisoners. The American Vice-Consul returned to the shore. He advised, it was said, the Malietoa men in possession to lay waste—burn the island over. The ships steamed away, a sky angry with the reflection of the wide-spread desolation—a lesson in civilization taught by a New Zealand American Vice-Consul."

Pending the decision of the Treaty Powers, Mataafa and his principal chiefs were deported to Fakaafu, one of the Union group, and thence, early in November, were carried to Jaluit, in the Marshalls, formerly for a time Laupepa's place of exile. Despite repeated endeavours on the part of the United States to bring about an earlier restoration to Samoa, their banishment lasted five long years. Of Mataafa's weary, uneventful life during this unhappy period, it is unnecessary to say more than that, by his unpretending piety and patient, dignified resignation, he earned the good-will and respect of every German official with whom he came in contact. Finally, in response to repeated petitions to Samoa, the Powers made a great show of magnanimity, and on September 19th, 1898—a few weeks after the death of Malietoa, their puppet king—Mataafa was permitted to once more set foot on the soil of his beloved country. Before, however, he was suffered to leave Jaluit, a written pledge was exacted from him—not, as has more than once been officially and wilfully misrepresented, that he would “henceforth abstain from Samoan politics,”—but that he would remain loyal to the Government of Samoa, as established by the Berlin Act, and to the successor of Laupepa when chosen. The pledge, *in extenso*, was made public immediately Mataafa entered Mulinu'u, and was certainly never regarded by either whites or natives as an obstacle to his election as king—indeed, on October 5th, Chief Justice Chambers wrote a letter to a fellow-countryman and prominent supporter of Mataafa, in which the following sentences occur :

I am much occupied in telling people that I have nothing to do with the chief Mataafa, he having the same right to aspire to the kingship as any other Samoan, and if the people elect him as Malietoa's successor, in a rightful manner, according to the laws and customs of Samoa, why shouldn't he have the office?

The rapturous welcome which Mataafa received from apparently every section of his countrymen, made it clear from the very beginning that no other king was possible, if the “free right” of the people were permitted to be exercised. Until after his election at Mulinu'u on November 12th, no other candidate was even mentioned. Then, first, Tamesese, the son of the German *protégé* of 1887-9, and subsequently Tanumufili, son of Malietoa Laupepa, were nominated and declared elected by small gatherings of supporters. Of the moral and intellectual character of Tamesese nothing very creditable can be stated—his only claims to fame appear to be nominal Protestantism, a



ready capacity for changing sides and coquetting with all parties, and a certain reputation as a rebel against Malietoa's Government. Concerning the candidature of the youth Tanumufili, I have some difficulty in writing seriously. Though a king's son,<sup>1</sup> his existence was almost unknown in Samoa until, suddenly, the happy thought occurred to a coalition of zealous sectarians, rowdy copra-buyers, and hungry holders and seekers of office, that in him might be found a pliant instrument for advancing the interests of the Protestant Missions—and their own. With the aid of their native dependents in Apia, and having persuaded Tamasese that it would be greatly to his advantage if he were their ally, they were soon enabled to pose as the champions of a considerable minority. Within a few weeks after his discovery in Mr. Hill's school at Leulumoega, whence he was brought sorely against his will, Tanu blossomed into a full-fledged king, elected, so his supporters declared, "according to the laws and customs of Samoa." I have elsewhere<sup>2</sup> discussed at some length the egregious "legal" decision which declared Mataafa ineligible and Tanu the duly-elected king. Since the article referred to was written, I have spent several months in the islands, but without finding any cause to modify my opinion. Of the leading events which followed Chief Justice Chambers' decision I need now say little, for they are doubtless still fresh in the memories of my readers. I would that they could be blotted from the pages of history, for the latter will surely depict England and America, the boasted homes of liberty, united in an unholy alliance to deprive a free people of their natural and guaranteed rights by means which certainly no casuist can defend.

During the two and a half months following January 4th, Mataafa was recognized by all three consuls as head of a Provisional Government. In this position he had to face insuperable difficulties, yet his most severe critics cannot but admit that he displayed remarkable qualities of constructive statesmanship. Afterwards when this Government was over-

<sup>1</sup> Hereditary right, as we understand it, is quite foreign to the laws and customs of Samoa. A chief's son, as such, has no claim to succeed to his father's rank, and more frequently than not the choice of the electors falls upon a nephew or adopted son. In no case, however, can the family "name," or any title of honour, be conferred upon an untattooed youth. As Mataafa points out in his appeal to the Powers, "such a thing has never been known in Samoa—that a boy should be clothed with the power and authority of a high chief or king."

<sup>2</sup> "The Samoan Crisis and its Causes," *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1899.



thrown, and he and his people were compelled to withdraw to the bush, he proved himself no mean tactitian. More recently in his retirement at Aliepata, he has developed a pronounced capacity for literary expression. I have before me, as I write, a copy of the appeal which he addressed a few months ago to the three Treaty Powers, narrating the principal incidents of the struggle in which he had recently been engaged, describing the privations and sufferings which had fallen to the lot of the Samoans, and entreating the three Governments and peoples to assist "the injured and the wronged." "For myself," he wrote:

I ask and desire nothing. My years cannot be many, for now I am old. The grave will soon enclose me, and I shall be no more. But the people who have loved me long and love me still, will live for many years after I am gone. The strong men who have served me so bravely and faithfully, the women who for my sake have endured so many hardships and privations, and the children whose laughter and sport have made the villages joyous and happy, these will be living when I am known no longer in Samoa. It is for their sakes that I raise my voice, and pray that the Great Powers, in their generosity and kindness, will grant my request. Thrice have I been elected King of Samoa, by the free-will and choice of the great majority of the people, and according to our laws and customs. . . . When the people asked me on the last occasion to become their King, I thought there were none to oppose or cause trouble, for it seemed to me that all Samoa was united. I was not eager to rule, for I had been five years in exile from my native land, and I wished to live peaceably and quietly in Samoa for the remainder of my life; moreover, Kings of Samoa have ever been beset with dangers, difficulties, and troubles. But I believed that the people desired me to rule over them, and I thought that I could govern them in such a way that all Samoa would be happy, contented, and peaceful. But certain evil white men led a portion of the people astray, beguiling them with falsehoods and deceptive promises. . . . I believed also, and felt sure, that the German Government no longer objected to my being appointed King. And this being so, I cannot understand why evil and designing white men, who were not authorized by the German Government, should make an objection which did not concern England or America, but only Germany.

Mataafa goes on to speak of the "unrighteous judgment" of the Chief Justice, "an ignorant man and also not upright;" of the anger and indignation of the people; of the recognition of his Government by the Consuls; of the arrival of Admiral Kautz, his threats to bombard Mulinu'u, and the enforced retirement therefrom of the Mataafa forces; of the bombardment

of Apia and Stevenson's house ; of the fighting in the bush ; of the destruction of boats and plantations ; and of the ruthless shelling of towns and villages, "none of which could defend themselves, for the people in them had no thought of fighting, being nearly all old men, women, children, and pastors." Again beseeching the Great Powers, out of their abundant wealth, to grant to the living victims some compensation for the grievous sufferings inflicted upon them, Mataafa thus fitly concludes his simply-worded, yet eloquent, appeal :

The smile of God brightens the lives of those who assist the injured and the wronged, and the blessings of those whom they relieve will continually follow them.

So far the only replies vouchsafed to this prayer, and other similar petitions, have been the virtual extinction of Samoan independence and the partition of the islands. Though it is impossible to defend these measures, except perhaps on the score of international expediency, I am sanguine that in the end they may prove beneficial to the long-harassed Samoans. In one matter, at least, Germany has already shown herself wise and generous—she has allowed it to be made known that if the people of Upolu and Savaii still desire Mataafa to be their King, she will offer no opposition. The Samoans, needless to say, have been prompt to avail themselves of this act of grace, and thus it happens for the fourth time, that Mataafa has been elected to the highest position among his race. Surely there is no man, white or brown, who has enjoyed the opportunity of knowing this veteran hero, who does not hope that Mataafa's last days may be spent in peace and comfort, in the midst of the grateful, loving people whom he so long and faithfully has served.

It is probable that to one side of Mataafa's character justice will never be done. He will in all likelihood go down to posterity as a patriot-warrior, the last and assuredly the greatest of Samoa's monarchs ; but the world will never know him as the enthusiastic, yet level-headed, vindicator of his people's capacity for social and economic development. Wherever Mataafa has exercised authority, the Samoans have proved themselves industrious and adept tillers of the soil, moral, peace-loving, and truthful. While he was at Malie in 1891-3—intriguing, as was alleged, against Laupepa's throne—Mataafa was devoting himself to the planting of cacao, and to the instruction of the Samoans who were loyal to his fortunes in

*papalagi* (foreign) methods of fruit and other culture. Half or more of Stevenson's plotting with Mataafa was in regard to cacao and ramie; and not very long before Mataafa's deportation, Tusitala had engaged to provide, at his own expense, the necessary decorticating machines, and to teach the people how to cure the cacao and ferment it. Mataafa's keenest regrets, it always seemed to me, were that the Powers had allowed themselves to be repeatedly hoodwinked by the intriguing whites and debased, "loafing" Samoans of Apia. I have met very few men among the civilized nations who impressed me as holding in more lively abhorrence lying, duplicity, and every form of immorality. Very often he has endangered his authority over powerful adherents rather than permit laxity of conduct to pass unproved.

Among Catholics, Mataafa should enjoy the highest measure of esteem. Because of his faith he has suffered much; yet his steps have never faltered, nor has he sullied his reputation by unjust or vengeful thoughts. Moved by considerations often the reverse of creditable, sectarians have sought to excite a prejudice against him by describing him as a "savage" and a bigot. Unhappily for themselves, however, they have never ventured to bring forward a specific charge, or even a fragment of evidence to justify their all too sweeping allegations. As to the epithet "savage," as applied to Mataafa, I very cordially endorse the following remarks of Mr. J. A. Mulligan, formerly U.S. Consul-General at Apia:

If to be broad, upright, and a singularly Christian gentleman, is to be a "savage," then is Mataafa one, as he is held to be. If to be simple, God-fearing, brave, honourable, just, full of tenderness and compassion, claiming nothing beyond the welfare and freedom of an abused people, who regard him as an idol, chastened by years of suffering and years of weary exile—at once simple, wise, and able—if these qualities, which all who come in contact with the man freely accord him, go to round out the *personnel* of a "savage," then it is unfortunate for the world that "savages" are of such rare occurrence.

Of the many Protestant missionaries in Samoa who have known Mataafa, no one enjoys a higher reputation than the Rev George Brown, the writer of the following testimony<sup>1</sup> to the high chief's religious sincerity and tolerance:

I have always felt that Mataafa was a strong man, and I believe him to be a good man. He is a devout member of the Roman

<sup>1</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, May 3, 1899.

Catholic Church, but he has never sought to use his high position to injure in any way any of the members of the Protestant Missions, many of whom indeed are his most ardent supporters.

During my stay in Samoa I devoted some attention to a study of Mataafa's sentiments concerning the Protestant Missions. If there had been the least ground for the suggestion that he is opposed to them on religious grounds, I should have very speedily heard of it, for prominent among those from whom I sought information were the white agents and native pastors of the London and Wesleyan Missionary Societies. From none of these, however, could I learn anything to give colour to the charge. Yet it was only too evident, in the case of the foreigners, that great alarm was feigned over the possibility of Mataafa's return to power—but not, of course, on his account, for against Mataafa personally they would not say a word. This policy of innuendo is not a novelty in the history of sectarianism in Samoa, as will be seen from the following quotation from Captain Bickford's report, dated August 16, 1893, to the Admiral commanding the Australian station :

A certain section of the community in Samoa state, or have stated, that the Catholic Mission have encouraged the party of Mataafa in their action against the Government. I have taken some trouble to arrive at a conclusion on this point, having communicated not only with the Fathers of the Mission, but with many others who are not in any way connected with them, either by religion or otherwise, and I am perfectly convinced that such is nothing but a malignant invention, probably started by ignorant, narrow-minded, and bigoted individuals. On the contrary, the one object of the Mission has been to endeavour to induce Mataafa to understand that the Powers, having placed the King where he is, must necessarily support him, and that it was his (Mataafa's) duty in every way not to put himself into opposition. . . . He is very generally respected, and looked upon as probably the most intelligent chief in Samoa.

It was my intention, when I commenced this article, to refer to the important and often heated controversy excited in Australia and certain circles in this country by charges and counter-charges concerning the relative attitudes and policies during recent troubles of the Catholic and Protestant Missions in Samoa. This task, however, I now propose to defer until another occasion, for the gravity of the question might require an encroachment upon the editorial space which at present I hesitate to hazard.

JOHN GEO. LEIGH.

## *A Model Anglican Archbishop.*

---

THE life of Archbishop Benson is quite a typical, we had almost said an ideal, specimen of Anglican biography. A scholar and a gentleman, a man of great ability and varied gifts, dignified in presence and condescending in manner, and with strong ecclesiastical tendencies combined with many of the qualifications necessary to a statesman, full of a kindly feeling to others, and of a genuine and hearty piety, firmly convinced that Anglicanism is about the best form of religion that the world has yet produced, the history of his life affords us a very characteristic and a very favourable specimen of the Anglican prelate of the end of the nineteenth century. He was not a man of genius ; he was not a great man, or one calculated to have any very lasting influence on the religious history of his country. But he was certainly a man of talent, and of talent a great deal above the average. He was a good administrator, a man of tact, and moderate in his views, quite a picture, in fact, of what an Anglican Bishop should be and ought to be.

Before we attempt to review in detail the story of his life, the question naturally presents itself, Is it possible for a man in such a position as his to reach a level of virtue to which we can in any sense give the name of sanctity ? Or is there something underlying the very nature of Anglicanism which renders holiness, as Catholics understand the word, unattainable by one who belongs to the Anglican communion ? To this question a Catholic can give one answer, and one only. Pious and virtuous an Anglican certainly may be. He may be united to our Lord by faith, hope, and charity. He may be a faithful servant of God according to the light he possesses. He may do a good work in his generation, and bring many souls besides his own to the knowledge and love of God. He may live an unblemished life, and die at peace with God. All this is, through God's mercy, within his reach, and as far as we can judge from his biography, Dr. Benson attained to it, and perhaps attained to it

in a high degree. But all this is not sanctity. It is something different, not merely in degree, but also in kind, from the holiness which characterizes the saints of the Catholic Church, and not the saints alone, but many a holy Catholic priest and layman, to whom the name of saint is scarcely applicable.

What is it makes the difference? What is the reason why, outside the Catholic Church, virtue can never rise to the level of sanctity? The question is a very interesting one, but one that it is not easy at first sight to answer, or at least it is not easy to give an answer of which those outside the Church can see the force, which they can understand and appreciate. Yet the fact is an undoubted one. If *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, much more is it true that *Extra Ecclesiam nulla sanctitas*. The former we may qualify by the distinction that is to be drawn between the body of the Church and the soul of the Church. Anglicans and others outside the Church may belong to the soul of the Church, though they do not belong to that visible and concrete organization which we term the body of the Church. They can therefore save their souls, and we believe that thousands of them will do so. But the latter *dictum* does not admit of the same qualification. It is absolute and unconditional, if *sanctitas* be taken in the strict meaning of the word, as the mark of those who are called to the lofty heights of supernatural virtue which God has reserved for such as are the special objects of His love. It is not easy to define it, but every Catholic who has read the Lives of the Saints has recognized it as something which is exceedingly rare, even among the faithful children of the Church, and which places the man who possesses it in a category of his own, apart from other men. It connotes a very close union with God, a great love of prayer, a continual sense of the presence of God, an unfailing and habitual obedience to His holy will in every detail of life, an entire forgetfulness of self, and a neglect of self and of all that ministers to the love of self, and an intense love of others, not for any attractive qualities that they possess, but simply because they are the brethren and representatives of Jesus Christ, and are therefore loved for His sake. All this it connotes, and a great deal beside, and all in a supereminent degree, so that those to whom it is granted seem to belong to a higher sphere than that of ordinary mortals, and to be in some sense angels in human form.

Why is all this impossible to Anglicans? It is easy to find an answer which will satisfy Catholics. It is because there is



a continual stream of grace flowing into the souls of Catholics through those channels of grace which Christ has reserved for the members of His Visible Church, through the sacraments and the sacramentals. It is because the fruits of every Mass said all the world over belong as of right to Catholics, in a way in which they do not belong to those outside the Church. It is because of the intense and peculiar love which Christ our Lord entertains for His Body, and for all those who are members of it, in which special love none else participate, although at the same time all mankind are the objects of His love. It is because the faithful who belong to the Church are the children of Jesus Christ in a sense in which none others are, sheep of His flock, members of the household of God, heirs of the promises, temples of the Holy Ghost, partakers of the heavenly banquet of His own Body and Blood, as those outside the Church cannot be. All these and a thousand other privileges are the exclusive heritage of Catholics.

But there is also another solution of the fact which even those outside the Church can scarcely deny, that within the Church saints abound and flourish, but not outside. If we turn our thoughts away from the supernatural gifts which are the heritage of the Church which Christ had founded, and of none other, and look at the different conditions of existence, which separate off those within the Church from those outside, we notice two points of contrast which necessarily affect the whole of the spiritual life of the individual. The one refers primarily to belief, and secondarily to practice. Those within the Church pass their lives in a continual and necessary attitude of obedience to an external authority, which lives and speaks and cannot be misunderstood, and which determines for them what they may lawfully believe and what they may not. It cannot be evaded, its decisions cannot be explained away. It speaks with a voice which is always authoritative, but is infallible and incontrovertible only in its highest and ultimate mouthpiece, the voice of him who sits on Peter's chair.

The result of this organized system of hierarchical authority in matters of belief, is that while all reasonable liberty is given to every one of the faithful, they, at the same time, exercise that liberty within very definite bounds and limits. Every opinion that a Catholic forms for himself in matters that concern belief, is formed only in a spirit of submission to and dependence upon the Church's authority, as expressed in its living voice. He



must be ready to abandon his most cherished opinions, if that voice proclaims them to be at variance with the body of doctrine which our Lord entrusted to the keeping of the Church.

Now all this requires the exercise of no small degree of intellectual humility, not perhaps in the mass of the faithful, who do not think for themselves, but in men of cultivated minds, powerful intellect, and extensive and accurate knowledge. They have often to give up what seems to them the more probable (amounting in their eyes, it may be, to a sort of moral certainty) for what appears to them less probable. It demands of them the sacrifice of many a favourite hypothesis which has so much to recommend it, that it comes before their minds as almost a certainty. It involves a surrender of intellectual freedom that is very difficult to the proud intellect of man. But it is this surrender, this subjection of the fallible human reason to the infallible teaching of Faith, which is, at the same time, the glory of the Catholic Church, the safeguard of religious truth, and—for this is our present point—the very foundation of all sanctity for the individual Catholic, involving, as it does, the presence in the soul of a very real, very meritorious habit of humility.

The Anglican, on the other hand, has no Church which imposes on him any dogmas as of necessity to be believed, or if she does so, she tells him at the same time that nothing is to be required of him, unless it can be established by God's word written, and of what may be so established he, and he alone, is the final judge. He practically roams about in intellectual liberty, or to speak more accurately, intellectual license, and this absence of any effective control over his judgment deprives him of what is an essential element of sanctity, so that he who craves after anything like holiness, instinctively looks out for some system which shall exercise over his reason that control which he feels that it stands in need of. He soon discovers, if he has the opportunity of becoming acquainted with her, that the Catholic Church, and she alone, can supply his need. If he is content with Anglican liberty of judgment (I am speaking of educated and thinking men), he thereby acquiesces in a low standard of virtue. He may be virtuous, just, liberal to the poor, honourable, prudent, self-sacrificing, but a saint—never. He cannot even attain to a high level of supernatural virtue, such as is reached by hundreds and thousands of Catholics who have no sort of pretension to the name of saint.

But there is a second bar to Anglican sanctity. Besides this submission of the judgment, there is also a submission of the will that is required of every Catholic, and which in practice is nothing else than the virtue of obedience. A Catholic has certain very definite laws which he has, willy nilly, to obey, if he is to save his soul. He must go to Mass on every Sunday and holyday, he must abstain from meat on Fridays, and must fast, if he can, on fast-days. He must go to Confession and Communion at certain stated times; he must also conform to rules and regulations as to his marriage and the bringing up of his children. To all this the Catholic layman is subject, under pain of serious sin, but the priest has many other obligations besides. He has a number of stringent rules as to every part of his priestly life, as Holy Mass, Confession, and the other sacraments, his daily Office, &c. He has to render obedience to his Bishop, who stands to him in the place of God, and to his other ecclesiastical Superiors. Bishops again have to obey their Metropolitan in all things belonging to his office, and the Pope in all things whatsoever. Savonarola was not excused from his obedience to Alexander VI. because of the reports as to the Pope's character, or by the dangers which he thought he might incur at Rome. Now all this involves a habit of submission which is the second foundation of sanctity. It means a constant atmosphere of self-restraint and subjection pervading his whole life.

Here again, in every department of life, there is a complete contrast between the recognized obligations of a Catholic and an Anglican. The latter only attends church when he pleases; there is no binding obligation for Sundays or festivals. If he fasts or abstains, he does so because he chooses to fast or abstain, not because he is bound under sin to do so. If he frequents the sacraments, he does so because he likes to frequent them, not because there is any rule that obliges him. He can marry almost any one he pleases, and brings up his children as seems good to him. The Anglican clergyman, again, has almost unlimited liberty in his manner of conducting the services of Anglicanism. He can dress himself in surplice, or in chasuble; he can administer Communion morning, noon, or night, and as for obedience to his Bishop, the obligation is of so very limited a nature that only in very extreme cases can the Bishop interfere to enforce his commands. And as for a Bishop, he is free from any obedience whatever, unless it be to our Sovereign Lady the

Queen, the Head of the Anglican Church, whose ecclesiastical authority is, for Bishops generally, a very easy yoke. The Anglican, therefore, in whatever capacity, is left in practice free in almost everything to follow his own sweet will; and so alien is the spirit of Anglicanism to the spirit of obedience, that Religious Orders are almost unknown in practice among the members of the nobler sex, and only flourish (if they can be said to flourish) among women, as a feeble imitation of the Orders of the Catholic Church. Now without stringent obedience sanctity is practically impossible. He who longs after sanctity *ipso facto* longs after obedience. For this reason the man who longs after sanctity cannot remain contented in the Anglican body, and conversely, he who remains contented in the Anglican body cannot even long after sanctity (I am speaking as before of educated men), and much less can he be a saint.

I have spoken of this fatal defect in Anglicanism in relation to sanctity, because the subject is one of the greatest interest and importance, both to those within and those without the Church, and also because it explains why so many excellent Anglican prelates have never risen above a certain level of virtue, which is far removed from, and indeed something of an altogether different kind from, anything that deserves the name of holiness or sanctity. Of such prelates Archbishop Benson was an excellent specimen, and the impression which his life ought to leave on Catholics who read it is, that while they admire the man, they have every reason to thank God that they are not condemned to live amid the mists and fogs, and in the unwholesome atmosphere of Anglicanism.

Dr. Benson was born at Birmingham, and educated at King Edward's School there. The school has reason to be proud of the group of distinguished men who were boys there with him. Among them were Drs. Lightfoot and Westcott, the Biblical scholars, both of them successively Bishops of Durham; Charles Evans, who was afterwards Head Master of the School; and Father Purbrick, who was for nine years Provincial of the Jesuits in England, and now holds a similar position in the New York Province of the Society. Young Benson went up as a *sizar* to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1847. At the University he appears to have been a clever, hard-reading, cultivated man, and withal very high-principled and pious. We find him writing in 1848 to his friend Lightfoot his impression of Dr. Newman.

I had intended to say much to you about Newman, whom I heard preach a little while ago, a man in whom the severe mortifications of the middle ages are again revived. Christ help him. He taught me wondrous lessons.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time he himself was never a follower of Newman. In answer to Lightfoot, who had written to him in praise of the Tractarians, he expresses his sentiments as follows; and subsequent experience has shown that there was considerable truth and common-sense in his presage of the future:

I will not for a moment deny what you say of the High Churchman's character in general. Only remember that there must be something analogous in the beginning of every new system, I mean, to the state of society in which it makes its appearance, whether it be new altogether, or old revived, and considering that the next generation, or at least the next after that, which springs from these High Churchmen, will be born to the principles, and will go on in them, not as those who are bound to carry them out in practice, provided they support the externals in profession.<sup>2</sup>

Further on we have other details of Newman's sermon at Birmingham—

He [Newman] is a wonderful man truly, and spoke with a sort of angel eloquence, if you comprehend me. Sweet, flowing, unlaboured language, in short, very short and very pithy and touching sentences. Such a style of preaching I never heard before, and hope never again to hear. Yet it reminded me forcibly of Arnold, and his appearance was exceedingly interesting; he was very much emaciated, and when he began, his voice was very feeble, and he spoke with difficulty, nay, sometimes he gasped for breath, but his voice was very sweet. . . . But oh, Lightfoot, never you turn Romanist if you are to have a face like that—it was awful—the terrible lines deeply ploughed all over his face, and the craft that sat upon his retreating forehead and sunken eyes. He was a strange spectacle altogether, and to think of that timid-looking, little, weak-voiced man having served old England. . . . How painful it was to think that he had been once an English Churchman; and yet how can we wonder at the change when we think of the thousands of prayers offered up abroad and at home, in Church and in Chamber, that Newman might be converted, . . . yet to my mind it is difficult, nay impossible, to conceive that he has not sinned the sin of those who have left their first love. *Ora pro Jacobo (sic) Henrico Newman.*

This passage shows that Dr. Benson possessed another serviceable qualification for the Anglican clergy, viz., want of

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> P. 61.

consecutive thought. First he says, that the conversion of Newman was the result of prayer, and immediately afterwards, that it was the sin of those who leave their first love. The fact was, that the mind of Dr. Benson was rather emotional than logical; and of this we have a curious instance in his account of his visit to Rome.

I was close to the Pope, and he passed me several times. . . . He looked a wonderful figure, but more like a picture or a statue or a dream. . . . Then one looked up and saw round the dome beneath the great mosaics the awful legend, "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum," and felt for a moment as if they must be the historical chain that bound the earth to the shore of the Sea of Galilee, as if this were the mountain of the Lord's House exalted on the top of the hills. But it passed away in a moment, and one felt there must be a truer fulfilment somewhere, and then as one came out one saw the bronze statue of St. Peter with half his foot kissed away, &c.<sup>1</sup>

This is quite a typical instance of Anglican emotionalism and Anglican logic, and perhaps still more of the want of humility engrained in the Anglican mind, which causes Anglicans to regard the kissing of the foot of a statue, out of reverence to him whom it represents, as something unworthy of their dignity as rational men.

I do not, however, propose to deal with Dr. Benson's views on things in general, or to sketch out his successful career, first at Cambridge, where he was Chancellor's Medallist, then as a Master at Rugby, and next as Head Master of Wellington College. I shall confine myself to what illustrates that which I have said respecting the influence of Anglicanism on the religious sentiments and religious life of her members, and the very exact conformity to the Anglican type that marks his whole career. At Cambridge, indeed, we are told that "he was a decided High Churchman in matters of ritual," but like a true Anglican, he "combined this with a considerable breadth of view," and at a rather later date was supposed to have leanings to Latitudinarianism. At Wellington, he says of himself, "I am myself neither High, nor Low, nor Broad Church, though I hear myself consigned by turns to all, as often to one as to another."

At the same time, thorough Anglican that he was, he did not take a very hopeful view of the prospects of Anglicanism. Thus he writes to Lightfoot in 1865:

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 122, 123.

What bad times these are ! . . . Save two or three, the only truth-loving men I know are humble-minded enough, I am forced to confess, but scarcely to be called believers.

And the believers seem to me to be more and more Roman in spirit. I don't mean in articles of faith, but undistinguishingly blended with Rome in the reasons for believing.

How long will the Reformers' compromise endure ?

For three elements of disruption :

1. The expression in Scriptural words of things not directly stated in Scripture, and previously stated with more boldness and clearness in common words—such as the Sacrifice in the Eucharist, the power of the Keys, and other things—seems to me a difficulty of an awful kind. It must some day be allowed that the words are not to be relied on.

2. The figments of an authority in Scripture not needing an interpretation.

3. The territorial and political position of the clergy, intertwined with all constitutional order, not a standing army like the Roman clergy. These three things seem to me in our day leading up to some great complication.

While he was Head Master of Wellington, Dr. Benson paid a visit to his old friend, Father Purbrick, at Stonyhurst College, who was at that time its Rector. Some passages in his account of his visit gives us an amusing insight into the utter want of appreciation of and contempt for all things Catholic which was a part of Dr. Benson's convictions, and confirms our assertion that he was quite a model Anglican. Writing of this visit, he says :

My welcome from my dear old schoolfellow, Father Purbrick, the Rector of the College, was most warm and affectionate. . . . The Mass is a wonderfully strong statement against Transubstantiation (*sic*), and all that does offend me offends me so powerfully that it does not seem to colour the rest ; and all the Scriptures in honour of the day are noble.

After service, he dropped on his knees, and said one Our Father and three *Aves* for the Pope. It is thus that one suddenly pulls up to wonder if we are beings of the same sphere. So, after, we passed through a sort of cloister dimly lighted, with Fathers and boys on their knees before an image with a little light before it, "to which (Father Purbrick afterwards told me) the boys have a special devotion." Think of the Wellington College or Birmingham boys transformed into this ! I was amazed to hear this baseless nonsense, this mathematics applied to things eternal, gravely poured out by an honest, believing gentleman. . . .

And a great deal more to the same effect.

Yet in spite of this aversion to Catholic usages, and especially to those in which the Catholic spirit of self-

humiliation more specially declares itself, Dr. Benson seems to have been a really good and pious man. Canon Crowfoot writes of him as follows :

From earliest childhood as a very little boy it had been his delight to be in church, and to attend as many services as possible. . . . A born ecclesiastic, he was now called every day to do acts of worship in the most beautiful Cathedral in England. Lincoln Cathedral, "on its sovran hill," was a perpetual *sursum corda*. Every column, cornice, sculptured stone, or frieze was a memory recalling a glorious past, and bringing him into the immediate presence of the great Giver and Moulder of that past.<sup>1</sup>

And the following extract from a letter to his wife is redolent of a very strong feeling of piety, which has, however, a ring about it very different from the note of holiness such as we recognize in the letters of a Catholic saint :

While I have really and warmly believed, and thoroughly realized (I think I may venture to say) the truths of the unseen and the persons of that world, as actually taking part in this, still (I know not fully why) the facts which gave me such happiness and strength in other ways have not till lately, if even now, reacted with anything like proper force, on my temper, my pride, my resentment, my self-government, or my opinion of myself. I have prayed for humility and sweetness, yet I have not had before me the right ideal of character. But my notion has had in it a world of confidence in a naturally religious disposition, as if it had been a character formed and shaped by God, while it was not. This has been a snare of a most serious kind, and I have for years trusted to the religious sentiment to mould the life, without using anything like a careful interior discipline. The lost ground I have to make up is awful. It is I, therefore, who want your prayers, more than you mine.<sup>2</sup>

This passage, and a great deal more that follows it, is a very apt illustration of my remarks as to the impossibility of becoming a saint in the Anglican body. "I have not had before me the right ideal." No, and you never can have, outside the Catholic Church. In order that ordinary men may avail themselves of the perfect pattern set before us in the character of our Lord, it is necessary that it should be illustrated for us, and interpreted to us in the lives of His saints. Outside the Church an ideal life is an impossibility. "I have for years trusted to the religious sentiment to mould my life." Yes, and it is one of the characteristics of Anglican piety that it feeds chiefly on sentiment, instead of on the solid ground of fact ; on emotion, instead of on faith and love. We cannot

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 375, 376.

<sup>2</sup> P. 397.



help feeling sorry for Dr. Benson. In the rest of this letter he says many touching words respecting the love of our Lord and the necessity of begging of Him grace and strength.

I have passed over his active life as Chancellor of Lincoln, where he seems to have won all hearts and to have worked hard to promote the welfare of every class of the community, because it does not specially illustrate our present purpose. In a Cathedral city he had the palsyng influences of Anglicanism strong around him, and it is wonderful what he effected in spite of them.

In 1876 he was offered the bishopric of Calcutta, and the way in which he carefully set down the *pros* and *cons*, reminds us of the method recommended by St. Ignatius to those who have to decide on some important step in life, and shows how much, in spite of all his prejudices, he had in him of the Catholic spirit, if only it had not been choked by the unwholesome atmosphere of Anglicanism. But it is instructive to notice what was the motive that finally determined him to decline the post. It was nothing else than the consideration of the education of his children, as we see from the following extract from a letter to the Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. John Wordsworth :

Τέκνα ἔχειν πιστὰ is a Pauline note of a bishop. Whatever other charge is offered, these six souls have been committed to me, and after praying for light I cannot see how to leave them in danger of darkness. I must, therefore, and without question, and only now wondering that such an offer should in God's providence have come to me so placed, say that I should not be able to entertain the offer of the bishopric of Calcutta.<sup>1</sup>

We are quite sure that Dr. Benson in this decided according to his lights, that he conscientiously believed that he was doing the will of God in preferring these family considerations to all else. It does not, however, seem to have occurred to him, that if on other grounds Calcutta was the sphere of duty to which he was called, God would and could take care that no harm thereby befell his little ones. So in England he remained, and it was not long after this that he received the offer and accepted the bishopric of Cornwall.

And here we must leave him, hoping to continue in a future number of THE MONTH the history of his life as an Anglican Bishop and Archbishop, as a further proof of the depressing influence that was exerted over him by the spirit that rules the destinies of Anglicanism and its children.

R. F. C.

<sup>1</sup> P. 401.

## *Otherwhere.*

### CHAPTER XXVI.

WHEN they arose from prayer, the chieftain conducted Klemenké to the large tent in which she had been welcomed on her entrance into the "city." A repast of bread, goats' cheese, butter, fruits, milk, and wine, was prepared, and his mother and Myrna were in attendance to do the honours of the breakfast-table.

"My daughter has told me, Protectress, that it is your will to leave your people this morning. I should like you to see the holy wells on your way back. Will you go with me to your guards, and tell them to depart and await your coming at the southern end of the narrow pass? I will walk with you to the place. It is a very little way from here, but no horses can go there."

Klemenké consented with real pleasure. She was anxious to see as much as possible of the strange country in which she found herself, and she wished, without directly requesting it, to have if possible unrestrained conversation with the chief, whose whole conduct impressed her with the conviction that he was, notwithstanding his ignorance and superstition, one of those who was bent on doing the best he knew.

The guards received from their mistress the necessary instructions, and Klemenké returned to the tent, where the chieftain left her in conversation with the women, promising to come back in a short time to conduct her on her way.

It was evident that Myrna was very sorry that Klemenké was to depart so soon. She had hoped that the Protectress would continue with her until her husband returned. He had accompanied the messengers who had been despatched to ascertain the position of the royal army.

The young wife had an enthusiastic admiration for her husband. To talk of him and tell of his accomplishments was

evidently an extreme delight to her. She informed Klemenké that before their marriage he had spent more than a year at Kara, and that when there he had been accustomed to dress, not as a wild man, but in civilized fashion. She trusted he would never go there again. From the things he had told her, the innocent girl believed that the great city was a veritable pandemonium. The chieftain's mother and Myrna's two attendants sat beside them, and now occasionally joined in the conversation. They were all alike anxious to hear something of Klemenké's home. She gratified them by telling such things as she thought them in a state of mind to comprehend.

"My companions will accompany you, Protectress. I cannot leave the baby," Myrna said, when the chief returned, prepared to conduct Klemenké on her journey.

They crossed the circle to a point in the south-eastern part of the curve, where the creepers had been trimmed so as to form a low arch. Here appeared a flight of steps roughly cut in the rock. They were clearly very old. The feet of many generations had worn them away. The frosts of winter, too, may have helped in their disintegration. They had been but recently repaired. Pieces of riven pine had been secured so as to give a firm foothold. Thus the ascent, though steep, was a climb by no means difficult.

When Klemenké reached the top, she found that she had to go down-hill again. The stair on this side was not a long one, neither was it by any means so steep as that she had ascended. At the bottom was a large grassy plain, where a flock of tame goats was feeding. It was of a form so irregular that she could not see its boundaries in several directions. There were no signs of glacial action to be noted, but here and there huge jagged rocks rose up through the turf. Though lower than the top of the rim, this plain was much higher than the bottom of the craterlet. There was a very wide and highly picturesque outlook to the west and south; the north was hidden, where she stood, by the wall of the crater; the east blocked by the vast cloud-enshrouded mass of the quiescent volcano.

The scene was striking and novel. It was evident, from the remarks he made, that, wild as he and his followers might be, they possessed a love for some forms of natural beauty which is denied to not a few of those who regard themselves as highly cultured persons.

"I am very glad you love the land of your people," the

chieftain said. "This is a beautiful and a safe place. There is no approach for horses except the way you came yesterday. You will find before you join your guards that no enemy can get at us on this side ; but I have brought you to see the wells. Have you any in your country like this ?"

The object to which Klemenké's attention was directed was a funnel-shaped hole, at the bottom of which she could see, when she stood close by it and looked down, the glistening of bright water.

"It is a strange kind of well. Did you have it made?—it is so very narrow," she said.

As she spoke, he took up a spade which was lying near, and cutting up some sods, threw them down the cavity. The geyser—for such it was—soon showed signs of activity, and in a very short time shot up a column of hot water to a height of upwards of thirty feet.

"How very beautiful!" she exclaimed. "I know what it is now, but I had no idea there were such things here—we have none at Avenka. There are some a very long way off, in Rhusla ; they are so far north that Britna has never seen them. I asked her about them."

"Our people who live in those hills have told me about them," the chief said ; "but there are far more here than in Rhusla, and much bigger ones too. See, there are some bubbling springs of hot water with a stream not bigger than a kettle-spout ; but we must go to the big one near those tents. It will shoot up in a few minutes now."

They threaded their way among the little pools of hot water until they came to the place indicated. There she saw a regularly-shaped conical hill of whitey grey material, perhaps twenty feet high, down which a stream of hot water was running, which formed at a short distance a tepid lake. Near to it several tents were pitched.

"The wind is in the south," the chief said ; "we must stand on that side, or we shall see nothing for the steam."

While he spoke, the ground throbbed as if shaken by a slight earthquake, deep rumbling noises were heard, and in a few minutes a huge column of water shot up into the air to the height of nearly two hundred feet, giving off as it did so vast volumes of steam. As there was a pleasant breeze blowing, the steam was swept away from them, and Klemenké had the full advantage of the bright sunlight shining on the column as it

continued to shoot upwards and then fall down in curved cataracts of spray. The explosions of this geyser were timed to exact regularity, so that the chieftain knew when to conduct Klemenké to the spot. There were three others very near, almost as magnificent, but their displays were very irregular as regarded time.

"These wells are all holy," the chief said. "This one supplies the pond near the tents where our people come to bathe who have been crippled by the bad spirits of the frost—the things I mistook you for. God has not given us the power to build temples and ships, and to make clocks and watches, but he has given us these holy wells to cure our sick people. They are nowhere else except where the wild people live."

The man's devotion was very touching. Klemenké could not refrain from making a contrast between the simple faith of this barbarian and the narrow atheism of Fyné, and asking herself whether, viewed from the standing-ground of the intellect alone, the position of this wild chieftain was not a higher one than that of the refined and richly-endowed Princess.

They soon reached the edge of the plateau, and looking over the dizzy cliff, saw the guards below. So far as Klemenké could see, there was no way by which the lower region could be reached. She had now, however, such full confidence in her companion that no shadow of suspicion crossed her mind. After gazing on the stormy sea of mountain peaks for some time, and learning their names from her girl-companions, the chief guided her to a very narrow pathway, in its origin probably natural, but having evidently been improved by great and long-continued labour. He told her that this place was almost always blocked by dead brushwood, among which climbing plants soon grew, so that no way whatever was visible to the very few persons who now ever made use of the road below. A few days ago, thinking that it might prove useful in this disturbed time, he had caused it to be cleared out by the simple process of setting the brushwood on fire. The ashes left by the conflagration might still be seen in some places, between the clefts of the rocky floor on which she walked. He directed her attention to the piles of brushwood gathered on the heights, so that if there were any fear of the approach being used by an enemy, it might be entirely blocked in a very few minutes by the riflemen who would be told off to guard the place.

The chief rode beside Klemenké until she and her party

reached the shepherd's house of entertainment, where she had halted when she came. Here he took his departure, promising that she should hear from him as soon as possible after the return of his messengers.

We will now return to the head-quarters of the army. The King of Renavra is posted where we left him, and as yet there is no sign of the approach of the Imperial forces. It is evening. He and Sessos have been at work all day, and are now taking well needed rest. Eklis is with them. When war had become a certainty, it had been determined that he should remain at Avenka and by no means accompany the army; for this course he had himself assigned many most satisfactory reasons. He had pointed out that he was in no sense a man of war, and would therefore be only an incumbrance where military duties had to be performed, while in the present disturbed state of affairs he might be of service at Avenka. When he said this, the philosopher expressed exactly what he felt, but as the days passed on and no news of importance came to allay his curiosity, he waxed more and more fidgety.

One of his most marked characteristics was the desire which had possessed him all his life of seeing and hearing at first hand everything that was going on. There was hardly a country he had not visited, a great temple, church, picture-gallery, or museum he had not explored. One thing was, however, as he now sadly felt, wanting in the sum of his experiences. He had become far advanced in life without ever seeing a great battle. The few skirmishes in which he had taken part were such slight affairs that they would never be recorded in history; but here, just at hand, there was about to occur one of those great conflicts on which very much of the future civilization of the world must depend—a conflict waged between races with which he was familiar, and with all the leaders of which he was on terms of friendship. So he soon came to think that he would be thrusting from him an imperative duty, were he not to be an eye-witness of the dark tragedy. Partisan histories, he was sure, would be manufactured by the dozen, but he felt that there was no one in the universe who could relate what was about to happen, in the setting of its near and more remote causes, with the impartiality and verbal force he himself possessed. His acquaintance with the Duke, the King of Naverac, and the King of Renavra—the last of whom he had

been intimate with from boyhood—would make it certain that there would be no flaws in military details: therefore his history, if written, could not fail to be the standard work on which future ages would depend for knowledge concerning the great conflict between Kara and Avenka. How could he describe the details of each important scene if he were not on the spot? How could he grasp and depict the pathos of each situation if he only derived the details from second-hand sources? He turned these things over and over again in his mind. He made out a list of all the great war historians, from the invention of the art of writing down to the present day, and came to the conclusion that, as there was no war in the past on which more momentous issues had depended, so there was no writer of either the past or the present who had ever possessed the graphic art capable of dealing with the events of the next few days in a higher degree than himself.

Having not only made up his mind, but also arranged his ideas in orderly sequence, he waited upon the Queen to beg permission to repair at once to the scene of action. Avené, now as ever, was most gracious. There was a flicker of sarcastic amusement, just for one moment, in her dark eyes, as she gave her consent. Eklis was a quick observer. It did not pass unnoticed by him, but for once he was baffled; he could not interpret its meaning. Avené was not a philosopher, only a gentle, strong-willed woman of action and affairs, so she knew the character of Eklis far better than he did himself. She had been aware from the first that her old friend would never be able to restrain his eagerness for new knowledge and new sensations. It was a surprise to her that he had curbed his instinct for adventure so long as he had done.

The King of Naverac had come on shore again, and held a long conference with Muro. He had tried from the sea to gain some intelligence of the opposing army, whose advent was hourly expected. Nothing had been learned beyond the fact that small bodies of cavalry were stationed at various points near the shore, for the purpose of hindering a landing if not attempted in force.

Military talk was exhausted. The hours were very anxious ones. All lapsed into silence. Hulon was smoking placidly, watching, as it seemed, the evening closing in, and the dark shadows, whose home was in the pine-woods, creeping slowly over the vineyards at their feet. They did not seem to move,



but if he took his eyes off them, when he looked again there had been progress. Eklis was dozing, and there was on the face of both Muro and Sessos that strange look of vacancy which we sometimes see on the faces of even clever men when they are trying not to think. The monotony of silence was interrupted by the King of Naverac, who threw down the stump of his cigar with unwonted energy, exclaiming almost fiercely as he did so, "You are the very greatest fool I ever heard of, Sessos!"

His brother looked round with an expression of surprised amusement.

"Your experience must have been but limited in the ways of folly," he answered, good-humouredly.

"It is not a thing to jest of. I don't believe any other man in his senses would have let that lovely creature run the frightful risk she is now encountering. I have not made up my mind whether it is the more heartless or idiotic. There is not a man or woman alive who knows of it who does not blame you as much as I do," said Hulon. His feelings were deeply touched, and he could restrain them no longer.

"There will be a few in Avenka when they hear of it," Sessos said. He knew that his brother was in earnest, so he felt that the less he said the better. To take his punishment silently was the more prudent course, especially as he trusted to a strong revulsion of feeling as soon as Klemenké came back, if indeed she did return; but he found it very hard to divest himself of the agonizing dread of impending evil. Though Hulon's language, and still more his manner, was very far from soothing, he could not but be highly gratified at the admiration he had shown for Klemenké.

"I cannot believe what my brother says," Hulon said, after a very long pause, addressing the King of Renavra. "You are a native of this new world; tell me how the matter stands. It seems to me a mission so very dangerous that, except in a case of extreme necessity, I should have thought twice before I sent one of my own officers."

"However it turns out, we shall all of us love my dear cousin the more for it, and never blame Sessos," Muro replied.

The answer was not satisfactory, and Hulon was pertinacious.

"Undoubtedly; but then a gentle, refined creature like Klemenké seems to me so utterly unfitted for a mission requiring nerve and promptitude of a high order," he said.

"You only know one side of Klemenké's character. I agreed with Avené in thinking her the fittest person to send to Kara. She could not stop the war, but behaved splendidly, and then saving a slave from torture shows energy and skill, even that must count for something," replied Muro.

Eklis thought this an opportune moment for intervention. "It is because the mission must be so dangerous for a man, that her Royal Highness volunteered for the service," he said. "I feel as confident of it as if she had told me so herself."

"As I have told my brother before, I think that it was rash beyond expression for him to take his wife to Kara. I believed that to be the most dangerous exploit that even he would permit his wife to venture upon. I was mistaken. Having escaped that danger, he sends her among a herd of savages—cannibals for what I know—the chief of whom, the very man she has gone to see, tried to murder her but a few weeks ago," said the King of Naverac.

Eklis was impressed by Hulon's indignation and his evident anxiety for his sister-in-law's safety. As, however, his own judgment fully sanctioned what Klemenké had done, he determined to state what we may call the Avenka view of the subject. "If your Majesties will bear with my intrusion," he said, "I think I can defend both these seemingly dangerous expeditions. We all thought, for I was honoured by being consulted, that if her Royal Highness visited Kara she might possibly be able to hinder this sad conflict, for knowing both the ladies well, I felt sure that the Princess Fyné would become deeply attached to her Royal Highness. The war Fyné has been unable to prevent, though I know she has done everything in her power; but by a supreme exercise of self-restraint and wisdom, the Princess Klemenké was able to save Lady Britna. I was present at the scene where she accomplished this, and never before was so overwhelmed by admiration. I did not, as I have told her since, think what she has done was within the bounds of human possibility. I would not, of course, compare the fate of a slave-girl to even a slight risk to a Princess of Avenka; but we must judge acts by their value as they appeared at the time in the eyes of the doer, not as we estimate them ourselves."

Jesting with princes is proverbially a dangerous pastime, but Eklis felt sure that in Hulon's present state of anxiety regarding Klemenké, he would not resent anything that

redounded to her praise, and he also imagined that the name Britna might bring to the surface reflections not entirely ungrateful, and sentiments, perhaps, as yet, only vaguely formulated, which the keen-witted philosopher surmised to be floating in the King's imagination.

"It is because I admire and love Klemenké so much for saving Britna, a feat which to my dull understanding, though achieved, seems even now impossible, that I am indignant with this rash brother of mine for permitting her to incur a risk such as this."

"And yet, your Majesty, I am sure the mission her Royal Highness has now gone upon is intended to have results, the blessedness of which no one can at present estimate. It is just such a quest as Lady Britna herself would have undertaken, had circumstances allowed it," said Eklis.

"I trust not!" said Hulon, impulsively, and then, the instant after wished that he had not spoken. What, after all, was this freed slave to him, beyond being an object of reverence for her constancy and pity for her sufferings.

"It may be that your Majesty does not realize the full nature of the design the Princess has at heart. She knew that when the troops of Avenka began to pour through the cave, she would be regarded as a goddess by these people; she moreover knows more now than either she or I did a few days ago, for Lady Britna was acquainted with many of the same tribes in her far away northern home. I have been taken into their confidence by these two devoted Christian women, and it is our opinion that, if care be taken, the whole of the tribes may be brought over to the true faith. I feel sure that it was this latter mission which impelled the Princess to take the very first opportunity that offered of visiting them in their native fastnesses. I do not think" he said, his voice and whole manner changing, "that we need feel any alarm as to the fate of the Princess, but I anticipate a social convulsion when she returns. She will, no doubt, have been proclaimed a goddess. What will be her title from henceforth? Shall we be called upon to address her for the future as your Divinity, and must she not of necessity take precedence, not only of the sovereigns of Avenka, Naverac, and Renavra, but of the most august Emperor himself? It is terrible to contemplate what may come to pass. None of our books about ranks and titles contain anything that will help us out of a difficulty so entirely unforeseen."

Eklis would have expatiated at still greater length on this highly important subject had not the door flown open, and Klemenké rushed into the arms of her husband.

"It is well you have come back, sister ; we were all quarrelling about you," Hulon said, as soon as he was able to divert her attention from Sessos. Now that she had returned, looking so bright and cheerful, with the flush of health upon her cheeks, he felt some qualms of conscience for having judged his brother with such stern severity.

"Will it please your Divinity to instruct us as to the form by which we must for the future address you, for we have no doubt that you have been hailed as a goddess by your new friends," said the King of Renavra.

"Something not very unlike it," she replied ; "but had we not better first deal with the object of my mission, and then gossip about my adventures?"

---

#### CHAPTER XXVII.

SEVERAL days have gone by. The enemy is not in sight, but the position of the invading force is now known. It has halted at a point but little beyond the range of vision.

The Emperor had declared war before he was in readiness for the conflict, so the commander of his armies was compelled to halt. The work he had on hand, he felt sure, could not be much more anxious than a review. The forces which the Duke could bring into action, even if all were of the very best fighting material, were so few in comparison with those under his command, that but one result could occur. It was indeed true that he had heard that some help for the Duke might arrive from the unknown lands beyond the mountains. The Princess Fyné had told him so in a private conference, and he knew her well-informed ; but then she did not disguise her repugnance to an expedition on which the Emperor had set his heart, so he came to the conclusion that if a small addition were thus made to the Duke's fighting power it would not be of any appreciable importance. He had seen and conversed with Klemenké during her visit to Kara and could not but be aware that she was a civilized creature, but that did not influence him much in his estimate of the inhabitants of her country. He was aware that there were instances in the present as well as the past where

reigning families have acquired such surface refinement as is regarded as necessary, while the people who support their vices are sunk in barbarism. That it was so in this case he felt sure ; yet it was provoking that rumours of this kind should have been spread abroad, and still more so that the responsible authority at Kara should, by official delays, hamper his progress, and hinder him day after day from completing a task which the Emperor had so much at heart. The declaration of war on the part of the King of Naverac, and the near presence of his fleet, was undoubtedly disturbing ; but this was a matter for the naval authorities, not for him. It was generally regarded rather as an act of rough diplomacy than anything more serious : an endeavour to help a friend in a grave emergency, rather than a manifestation of hostility against what had long been a friendly Power.

Once more it was eventide. The sun was sinking in the sea, shrouded in a thin haze, enough to mitigate the fierceness of his rays though not to hide his glory. His light was not dazzling, but serenely beautiful. No longer a globe of fire, but a soft effulgence, whose subdued tones suggested that it was sent in mercy to those who now on that calm summer evening, for the first time beheld this vision of glory, who might be in bloody graves ere he should rise again.

There was something very touching in the thought that the first and last look of so many on a sight of such extreme beauty should convey a message of peace.

Klemenké and her husband were standing on the little green in front of their temporary abode. The sight was not new to Sessos, but he could never tire of sharing in the childlike delight his wife took in a form of beauty which to her was ever fresh. The last faint line of gold had sunk beneath the calm, gently-throbbing sea ere they turned to retrace their steps ; as they did so they were met by a young man in the costume of the so-called savages with which Klemenké was now familiar. She had seen him for a moment before, but so transiently that she did not at once recognize Myrna's husband, the son of the chief of the wild men. Now, as he approached, they both felt that he was one of those magnificent examples of masculine beauty which we encounter seldom even during a long lifetime. He was tall of stature, but so well proportioned as to escape conveying any of that unpleasant feeling of weakness and want of harmony which never fails to accompany the gigantic. The

simple costume he wore showed his muscular figure to the utmost advantage, and the rich gold collar around his neck indicated at a glance that he was of what we may without exaggeration call the royal line of his people. Nature had, in his case—what she does so rarely—adapted him to the life he was called upon to lead. His finely-moulded features and nobly-shaped head indicated power of thought and strong impulses under the restraint of a still stronger will.

He approached, and kneeling, pressed Klemenké's hand reverently to his lips. Then rising, he said: "Your mission has been discharged, Protectress. I have seen the commander of the forest-army of Queen Avené, and bear a despatch from him. It is addressed to the King of Renavra, but we serve you only, and it is to you I deliver it."

"The King is here," she replied. "Please accompany us to our quarters. I am sure there are many things besides what there may be in the letter we shall want to talk about to you; besides, I must tell you how delighted I have been by my visit to your home, and all the kind things your wife and father did for me. What a lovely place it is!"

The young chieftain may have never been taught that it is a duty to suppress signs of emotion, or if he had, the present occasion may not have seemed a fitting one for the exercise of that doubtful virtue. He showed, without any disguise whatever, the delight which Klemenké's words had given him.

"The son of the chieftain of my people," was the form in which she introduced her new friend to her cousin. "He has brought a despatch from the Queen's commander-in-chief, and I am sure has much other important matter to communicate."

The King read the letter, first himself, for it was in the language of Avenka, and then translated it aloud, so as to render it intelligible to Sessos and the young chieftain. They entered into a long and animated conversation, which we have no intention of condensing here. The news the young chieftain brought gave good reason for hope that a junction might take place between the two armies ere it was too late. The young chief—his name was Zabith, and we shall for the future call him so—had done more than was hoped for. His knowledge of the country and the ways of Kara, had forced on him the conviction that the approach of the second army was as yet unknown to those against whom it was destined to act. This

was indeed good news if it could be depended upon, and Zabith seemed to entertain no doubt as to its correctness.

He was asked to remain in the royal quarters, but declined on the ground that if he were not with them, the men whom he had brought would be in fear for his safety. "Our tents are in the valley not a quarter of a mile away," he said. They observed that whenever it was possible Zabith directed his conversation to Klemenké.

Sessos and his wife accompanied him to the little cluster of tents, which had already been erected for the accommodation of his guards, himself, and their horses. They had a pleasant walk beneath the stars. It was arranged before they separated that the interview should be continued in the morning. Klemenké had much to say and many inquiries to make; if she were to discharge, to any useful purpose, the functions of protectress of this strange folk, it was important she should know much of which she was at present ignorant.

Klemenké and her husband rose early. They were in conversation with Eklis on the little green when Zabith arrived. He saluted her in the reverent fashion to which she had now become accustomed, and then joined in conversation with her companions. They soon entered the house for breakfast. The King of Renavra was there. Hulon was with the fleet.

Zabith's manner had altered. He now talked freely to every one. They were all surprised at the amount of knowledge he had gained during his long visit to Kara. The great city, corrupt as it was, seemed to have done him no injury, while it had widened his field of vision.

When the long chat was over, Zabith arose to depart, saying his people would have the tents struck and the horses ready for his return journey. Klemenké and her husband accompanied him for a short distance, and she then learned that it was in a great measure the cruelty of the agents of the Emperor to the wild folk which dwelt in his dominions that had impelled their chief to unite his fortunes with those of the Duke. The arrival of Klemenké had been a great terror to the chief. When, however, he had discovered that she whom he had tried to kill had pleaded for him, it was difficult to continue to believe that she was an evil thing like unto those which dwelt in the temple-images at Kara. Now that her people were sending vast armies to the help of the Duke, and therefore to benefit his own people also, he had no doubt that Klemenké was the long-hoped-for



deliverer. Klemenké was not surprised that the chieftain should think in this manner, but it was strange that his son, with the far wider outlook which he possessed, should hold the same opinion regarding her. Zabith urged her to visit them once more as soon as the war was over, in terms of affectionate entreaty, which it would have been very hard to resist.

"When I come again you must try to believe all I tell you," she said.

"Can we help it?" he replied. "You will only tell us what is good, but you must not bid us live in stone houses, or stop long in one place."

Klemenké laughed. "Certainly not," she said. "Faith and justice have nothing to do with such things. Have you not already found out what my religion is?"

"I am not sure," he said. "We think you are a Christian, but we do not know what that means; but Britna, the woman you saved, told our people when she nursed them, that they should love their enemies. She is a good woman, but the Christians at the seaport and at Kara are ignorant and dirty, and do not tell the truth. They are not good at all."

"Many Christians, I am sorry to say, are very far from good," Klemenké replied. "We cannot talk of these things now. I will tell you very much you will like to hear when I come to stay with you again. It is time my husband and I returned now."

"Stay one moment longer, Protectress," he said. "My father told the Duke that he should bring two thousand men to his aid. We find there will be far more. He has arranged to keep under his own command as many men as he requires to guard the pass, and I shall take the rest—nearly all horsemen—to occupy the hills, near the right wing of your army, so as to give help if needed."

This was most satisfactory. Having explained to him that it was her will that if prisoners were taken they should be well treated, she bade him good-bye with a stately affability, which made a deep impression. Coupling all he had now experienced with what his father and his wife had told him, Zabith left Klemenké's side as firmly convinced that she was a being destined to be their protectress as the most ignorant of those who obeyed him.

They watched the horsemen as they wound slowly up the hill, their dark forms blending with the shadows which ever lurk

under the pine-trees. It was a sight which could not but move even the most unimaginative. Such child-like faith and loving trustfulness appealed strongly to natures such as theirs, the deep religious instinct which was the foundation of all standing in such sharp contrast with so much they had seen and heard elsewhere.

The enemy at length appeared, and so far there was no intelligence of Avené. The task of passing her horses through the cave had been a more tedious process than she had contemplated.

In cavalry the King of Renavra was stronger than his opponent, but then the masses of infantry poured forth by Kara might prove overwhelming. It was a cloudless morning. The sun shone with blinding effulgence. The commander of the invading forces had miscalculated. He ought not to have begun the conflict with the sun in his face. The battle began by a continued discharge of artillery, which was not replied to by the King, for he was unwilling that the enemy should know how weak he was in that formidable arm. It did but little injury, as his forces were posted beyond the brow of the hill, in places where very few could be seen. The Kara commander soon found out this was but a waste of time. Knowing that the Duke was but ill-provided with cavalry, and disbelieving that any important aid could have arrived from Avenka, he ordered the horse of his right wing to charge the left of that of Avenka, commanded by the King of Renavra in person. There was a vast difference in the material of which the two forces were composed. Those of Renavra were almost entirely small farmers or vine-growers, their sons and servants, men who were ardent Christians, who felt the cause in which they were venturing their lives was a holy war undertaken to destroy a heathen Power, which took a fiendish delight in the torture and death of those of the true faith. On the other hand, the forces of Kara were made up of pressed men, the younger sons of nobles, hangers-on of the Court and the great houses, and of that miscellaneous herd of nondescripts to be found everywhere, the end of whose existence seems to be drink and what they call sport. The commander-in-chief of Kara knew that a repulse at the beginning of the battle would be disastrous, so having ordered his cavalry to charge in quick time, he supported them by a heavy body of infantry.

The Duke had united his forces with those of the King of

Renavra during the night, and now commanded the right wing. No time was to be lost. He at once charged the left wing of the enemy with his own horsemen, and such of those of Avenka as could be spared. This seems to have been an unexpected move. The commander-in-chief of Kara could hardly believe his eyes when he beheld the enemy he despised acting on the offensive. For a little all was doubtful. Had the artillery at once played on the advancing horse, the result might have been different. The discharges began too late. The Duke was upon the infantry ere he had suffered serious damage. They were men who, though well-drilled and accustomed to mountain skirmishing, had never encountered trained masses of horsemen in their lives. After a fierce but brief struggle they gave way. Had the Duke pursued them, it must have been an utter rout, so far as the left wing of the invading army was concerned; he could not however do this, for although the cavalry under the command of Muro was able to repulse that sent against them with great loss, they found themselves in the moment of victory attacked by what seemed an overwhelming force of the flower of the infantry of Kara. The Duke knew that but one result could follow if the left wing of Avenka should be broken, so he at once dashed diagonally across the plain, heedless of the fatal artillery discharge that was poured upon him, and took the infantry of Kara in the rear. The men still fought with desperate bravery, but their position was hopeless. They did not fly as their brethren of the left wing had done, but retreated in an orderly manner to the west. This was a grave mistake, for they exposed themselves to the fire of the Naverac ironclads. Many fell, but it was not so much the loss they sustained by the cannonade from the sea, as the disheartening effect of this new danger. Their commander now knew that the presence of the fleet of Naverac was something of a more serious nature than mere naval parade.

The invading force had suffered a severe repulse, but nothing in the nature of an overthrow. There was no reason why the battle should not be renewed, for there were still several hours of daylight. Muro and the Duke felt sure that it would be. Their opinion would no doubt have turned out to be correct had not an event occurred which they ardently longed for, but did not anticipate until it should be too late. It struck consternation into the invading army.

The commander-in-chief was arranging his forces so as to

attack the King of Renavra's position with the whole power of his cavalry, while he kept the rest at bay by the heaviest possible discharge of artillery, when he became aware of an enemy whom he had never calculated upon in his rear. The position was now critical. He knew nothing of this new force. He had already found the black soldiers of Avenka and their green brethren of Renavra far more serious enemies than he had anticipated. He was a brave man, no thought of retreat entered his mind. The danger was however far greater than he could understand. He had little time for arranging his plans. He knew of the approach of the Forest army but a very little earlier than the Duke and Muro did.

Klemenké was, during the lull, doing what she could for the relief of the wounded. She was interrupted in her work of mercy by the arrival of one of the wild men. He bore a letter from Zabith telling her of the near approach of succour. He had sent two messengers by different routes with his letter in duplicate, fearing that one of them might fall into the hands of the enemy. The second arrived safe while the first was speaking. She knew that it was of imperative obligation for a soldier to sacrifice all else for military duty, so she deserted for a time the work on which she was engaged, and at once repaired to the point where Muro and the Duke were standing under the shadow of a plane-tree in consultation with some of their more important officers.

"The day is ours," Muro said, when he had heard what she had to tell, "if we act with common prudence. Do not let the good news be known at present—it will make our brave fellows wild—go on with your work of charity, and my orders as your commander are, that when the firing begins again, you do not expose yourself." As he said this he and the Duke proceeded to make arrangements suitable to the altered circumstances.

They were not long ere they became aware of the near approach of succour, for they saw the Kara commander wheel his artillery round so as to meet this new enemy. He was by no means prepared to find that these reinforcements from Avenka possessed far more and far heavier guns than his own. A fierce cannonade went on for some time, causing great slaughter on both sides, but otherwise producing no visible result. Muro dare not let his cavalry charge, for thus he would have exposed them to the raking fire of their own friends.

The firing ceased on the part of the new arrivals. It was

evident that the Queen's general had—no doubt through the agency of Zabith—become aware of what had occurred in the morning. Heavy bodies of cavalry charged the right wing, and as soon as this was seen, Muro poured his cavalry upon them, while the Duke from his own post attacked those opposite him. The right wing was utterly broken. The commander-in-chief thought that even yet he might make an orderly retreat with the left, over whom the Duke was as yet only partially successful. With a handful of men he dashed forward, but he was too late; a fresh body of the new-comers had burst upon the Kara infantry from behind, and almost at the same instant a strong body of the wild men, under the command of Zabith, attacked them from the east, doing terrible execution with their long spears. The poor fellows had no hope of quarter from the victors, whom they looked upon as savages, so now every one thought but of saving himself by flight.

The commander-in-chief was in imminent personal danger. He could see none of the Ducal forces; had he done so he would have given up his sword. The only hope of safety which occurred to him was to make a dash towards the hills, and by mountain pathways make his way northward until he could fall in with the wreck of his infantry. With but three or four followers he succeeded in crossing the corpse-strewn plain, and entering a pine-clad gorge. He had no knowledge of the neighbourhood, but he thought that there could be no doubt that he should soon come upon the hut of some woodcutter or shepherd. In this he was mistaken; though the path was a beaten one, he encountered no sign of human habitation. After riding some distance—a way which seemed very long in his depressed state of mind—he came to a solitary oak of gigantic proportions. The trees around it, if there had ever been any, had been cleared away, so that it stretched out its wide-spreading arms in every direction. On its bole was fastened a sheet of paper on which was written in bold, clear characters, "Surrender! you are surrounded by the Princess Klemenké's horsemen. You will be treated as prisoners of war."

"This is no jest," he said to the officer who rode next him, "but it may be a trap set to catch unfortunates like ourselves. Klemenké is the name of the woman Prince Sessos married and brought with him to Kara, but she can have no cavalry. She is not queen of these barbarians; and then to whom are we to surrender, there is not a soul to be seen."

"The man who wrote this knows our language," replied the officer whom the commander addressed. "The handwriting is that of someone who seems to know how to use a pen, but he is not here to receive our answer."

"True," answered the general, "we must if accosted act according to circumstances. The woman herself is not a savage, but what do we know of the people who profess to serve her. However barbarous they may be, these creatures know how to fight."

The commander ceased speaking. They rode onward in moody silence, ignorant of the route they were following, until the shadows of evening gathered round them.

## *A Letter from Mr. Joseph Hocking.*

*To the Editor of "The Month."*

SIR,—Will you allow me space in your magazine to offer some remarks on the fifteen-page review which Mr. James Britten has contributed to the January number of *The Month*, on my romance entitled, *The Scarlet Woman*?

With regard to his opinion of the story, as a story, there is but little need to say anything. Indeed, he has scarcely offered an opinion. I should judge that he approached the book with the intention of saying everything he could to its detriment, and I hope he is satisfied with his work. Neither will I refer at length to his two suggestions: first, as to the motive which led me to become a novelist; and second, as to the reason why I did not treat of indecent subjects. No man with self-respect would care to answer them. If Mr. Britten had confined himself to adverse criticism and unworthy imputation, I should have taken no notice of his effusion, but as he has touched on more serious matters, I am naturally anxious, although I know these lines will be read by unsympathetic eyes, to call the attention of your readers to certain facts.

First of all, I would like to deal with Mr. Britten's endeavour to destroy whatever weight the romance may have, by seeking to prove (by a peculiar method of placing statements in private letters, and public statements to a reviewer in parallel columns) that I am guilty of lying. These I will take in order, as well as Mr. Britten's somewhat complicated narration will allow me.

1. I stated in a review in the *Temple Magazine*, in whose pages *The Scarlet Woman* appeared as a serial, that when I went to Ireland for the purpose of writing the story, I was received by the heads of Jesuit Institutions, while he infers, from private letters, that I was received by the Rev. Thomas Finlay, and by the Rev. W. Sutton, only one of whom is at the head of a Jesuit Institution.

Let me say, in answer to this, that I had long interviews in Dublin, first, with the Rev. Father Bannon; second, with the Rev. Wm. Sutton; and third, with the Rev. Thomas Finlay. If those gentlemen are not the heads of Jesuit Institutions, I was simply misinformed. Certainly Father Finlay was mentioned to me as one of the principals of the Jesuit Institution at St. Stephen's Green, while Mr. Britten admits that Father Sutton is the head of Milltown Park College.



2. I stated in the *Temple Magazine*, that I was received by men of the highest position in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. In my *private* letter, I said that I saw only Jesuit priests. These two statements, according to Mr. Britten, contradict each other. It is perfectly true, that the only ecclesiastics of note whom I saw in Ireland were Jesuits, but I still hold that I was justified in my statement, that is, if the information I received was correct. Take the names in order. (a) The Rev. Father Bannon has been, so I was told, a chaplain of Jefferson Davis, in the American War, and that he has been repeatedly employed on important affairs at several European Courts. (b) An Irish ex-Member of Parliament, who gave me a letter of introduction to Father Finlay, spoke of him to me as the ablest man in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, one whose opinion had more weight than that of Bishop or Archbishop. This opinion, I may add, was repeated to me more than once by more than one person. (c) The Rev. Father Sutton is the rector of Milltown College, for the training of priests, and was spoken of to me as a gentleman of great intelligence, and one who was much trusted. My statement, therefore, that I was received by men of the highest position in the Catholic Church in Ireland does not seem to be exaggerated. It is true, I did not mention the Rev. Father Bannon in my letter to Mr. Britten, simply because I did not think his questions necessitated it.

3. In the *Temple Magazine*, I stated that I read the rules of some of the principal monasteries, and saw their method of study and life. In a private letter to Mr. Britten, I said that I asked for the printed rules of a convent, but was unable to get them. Both these statements are perfectly true. I *did* ask for the printed rules of a convent, and was unable to get them, but I read the rules which Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus, drew up himself for his followers, rules which two out of the three gentlemen I have mentioned, told me were authoritative to-day in Jesuit Institutions.

4. In the *Temple Magazine*, I said I was given all the information I desired, and that priests offered me every facility for obtaining knowledge. Mr. Britten quotes letters from Fathers Finlay and Sutton, to the effect that they told me nothing which I could not get from any one, or from books easily procurable. Let me, in answer to this, say distinctly that, after Father Finlay had given me a minute description of the daily life of the novice (*he* said it was minute), he informed me that what he had told me was unknown to the ordinary secular priest. Moreover, beyond the book, entitled *The Jesuits: their Foundation and History*, which I quoted in my story, neither of these gentlemen mentioned these easily-procurable books, although, I repeat, they expressed themselves as desirous of giving me whatever assistance lay in their power. Let me add, however, that their information was in the main technical, and had nothing to do with the *incidents*

of the story. Of course, too, not a word to which either of them gave utterance, suggested to me either the characters or the actions of Ritzoom or Relly in the story.

These, as far as I can see, are the only "inaccuracies" of this sort which Mr. Britten points out, and I think I have fairly shown that they are not inaccuracies at all, but perfect statements of fact.

In answer to Mr. Britten's charge of ingratitude, that after receiving such kindness from Jesuits, I wrote such a book as *The Scarlet Woman*, let me say that for many Jesuits, as men, I have the highest esteem; and I have not the slightest doubt, that there are among them men of the most unblemished character. I was not, in writing the book, thinking of the individual, but of the system. Again, his statement that I deliberately charge the Jesuits with murder, is a gross perversion of the passages from which he quotes. Even the extract he gives does not prove it, while the passages as a whole, can be made to bear out his suggestion, only by the most unjustifiable method of exegesis. If Mr. Britten wishes to find justification for murder, under certain given circumstances, he should go to such Jesuit writers as Escobar, or to Mariana in his *De Rege et Regis Institutione*. He might also read with profit the History of Henry IV. of France, or of William of Orange. But his statement that I charge the Jesuits with such a crime, can nowhere be borne out by facts.

Concerning the general summary of what Mr. Britten calls a monstrous book, I am afraid you will not allow me to answer *in extenso*, but will you permit me to put a few questions as briefly as possible, which may help to sum up the situation?

1. Is it true that the main purpose in the training of a Jesuit novice is to teach him the lesson of obedience? That it is intended that he (the novice) shall lose his will, and affections in his Order, and that the command of the Superior in matters of duty shall be regarded as Divine?

2. Is it true that the Founder of the Society of Jesus taught that the "Superior is to be obeyed simply as such, and as standing in the place of God, without reference to his personal wisdom, piety, or discretion"? Is it true that he insisted that the novice should desire to be ruled "by a Superior who endeavours to subjugate his judgment, or subdue his understanding"?

3. Is it true that no matter what his age may be, any letters sent to the novice, are, or may be, intercepted and opened by the Superior, and if he, the Superior, thinks fit, may be kept from the novice altogether?

4. Is it true that during his novitiate even his parents cannot see him, except by the permission of the Superior?

5. Is it not true that it is the duty of the novice, if so ordered, to watch the actions of other novices, and report the same to the Superior?

6. Is it not true that after having taken "solemn vows," it is with the greatest difficulty than any one can leave the religious life? In other words, is it not extremely difficult for a nun after having taken

the "black veil" (as *per* the quotation which Mr. Britten makes from the *Spectator*), to walk, without let or hindrance, "out of the front door"?

7. Is it not true that, if a nun who has taken "solemn vows" does by any means go back to the world, and gets married, she is regarded as having committed a deadly sin, and that if she dies without repenting of that sin, she will, unless canonically freed from those vows, suffer everlasting torment in Hell?

8. Is it not true that St. Alphonso de Liguori teaches the following: "*If a man is questioned about anything that it is expedient to conceal, he may reply, 'I say no,' meaning 'I say the word "no," and this because the word 'say' hath truly a double meaning, for which reason it is lawful, for a just cause, to use equivocation in this mode among others, and to confirm the equivocation with an oath*"? And further, "A just cause is any honest end, in order to preserve good things for the spirit or useful things for the body."

9. Is it not also true that Liguori was canonized in Rome in 1839, and that he is regarded as a high authority on morals by the Roman Catholic Church?

If there is but one answer to these questions, and I have the gravest and most authoritative reasons for believing such to be the case—reasons which I shall be prepared to state, if necessity occurs, then I cannot see how, to use Mr. Britten's term, *The Scarlet Woman* is a monstrous book. It is true, I may have made technical errors, although I took the greatest care to avoid them, and if they are pointed out, will do my best to rectify them; but unless the history of the Jesuit order is not a figment of the imagination, and the writings of its most renowned teachers mere waste paper, my novel is not monstrous. If, I repeat, there is but one answer to the questions I have asked, then I have simply described what, under certain circumstances, is the natural outcome of the Jesuit system, and perhaps I ought to add, of the whole Roman Catholic system, when followed to its logical issue.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH HOCKING.

EDITORIAL.—As Mr. Hocking considers he has a grievance we are willing to let him state it, but he does not improve his case. The charge against him was two-fold, (1) that he had given an excessive account of his Irish Catholic sources of information, and (2) that by his mode of depicting the characters in his romance, he had practically announced that his Catholic and Jesuit informants confessed to the justice of the ordinary ultra-Protestant conception of Jesuits and nuns.

As regards the first of these points, it now appears that the priests he saw were three Jesuit Fathers, who will doubtless be flattered by the high opinion he has conceived of them, and one unnamed parish-priest from near Killaloo. Yet these under his pen "expanded" into

three apparently numerous categories—"Many Catholic priests" who "had long and interesting conversations" with him, *plus*, "the heads of the Jesuit institutions" who "received (him) with boundless courtesy," *plus*, "men of the highest positions in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland" who "cordially welcomed (him) and gave (him) all the information (he) desired." The rules of the Society of Jesus, which has neither monasteries nor convents, according to his present letter are all that he read, and these have become similarly "expanded" into the rules of some of the principal monasteries and convents—"I visited (he says) some of the principal monasteries and convents, read *their* rules," &c.

This first point is matter perhaps more for amusement than grave censure, though the exaggeration has its bearing on the second point, and this, if Mr. Hocking were a person to be taken seriously, is serious enough. Mr. Hocking offers to meet this second charge by proposing nine questions which he thinks we must answer to his mind. They rest chiefly on the false Protestant notion of Jesuit Obedience, on which we have written quite recently in an article bearing this name. (See *THE MONTH* for December, 1899.) There is no need to answer them further now, for they barely touch on the matters for which Mr. Britten criticised him, they are full of misleading phrases, bogus quotation marks, and insinuations, to deal with which would require many words, nor are they put for their own sakes, but to draw off attention from the real points. Here are the questions Mr. Hocking should have asked, and been prepared to stand by, had he really wished to justify his book; and here are the answers they require:

1. Is it not true that Jesuit Superiors listen behind doors when outside visitors are conversing with their novices? Answer: *No*.
2. Is it not true that Jesuit Colleges are liable to be built with the same party walls as neighbouring convents of nuns, with holes in such walls through which conversations may be held? Answer: *No*.
3. Is it not true that Jesuit confessors impose on their penitents such penances as to hold nocturnal meetings with persons of the other sex in convent gardens or elsewhere? Answer: *No*.
4. Is it not true that when a nun begins to repent of her solemn vows, not only is she not allowed to go out freely by the front door, but Jesuit Fathers conspire with Mother Superiors to imprison her in a cell, and torment her? Answer: *No*.
5. Is it not true that Jesuits have the practice of shadowing persons in whom they take an unkindly interest from end to end of the country, dressing up in disguise that they may do it the more effectually? Answer: *No*.
6. Is it not true that Jesuits have the practice of chloroforming unwelcome visitors, of abducting them, and holding them in illegal imprisonment? Answer: *No*.
7. Is it not true that "if (a leading Jesuit) wanted to kill a man he would take a similar course [*i.e.*, administer poison] except that nothing

would depend on accident . . . (and) he would do it in such a way that nothing could be traced to him"? Answer: *No, there is no ground either for the statement or the implication.*

8. Is it not true that Jesuits "allow nothing to stand in the way of accomplishing their purpose . . . (and that) if ever there is an obstacle in the way of a precious soul, they *remove that obstacle* [which, *pace* Mr. Hocking, obviously means that they are prepared if need be to 'murder' the obstacle]"? Answer: *No.*

9. Is it not true that by representing Father Ritzoom as the type of a leading Jesuit, after having first stated that he had prepared for his book by interviewing "the heads of the Jesuit institutions," Mr. Hocking inevitably suggests to the reader that Father Ritzoom was the sort of character he had found these to be? Answer: *Yes, although he has to confess that "not a word to which either of them (i.e., any of his Jesuit informants) gave utterance suggested to him either the characters or actions of Ritzoom or Relly in the story." Of course the readers of THE MONTH knew this already. But Mr. Hocking's Protestant readers may well not suspect it, until he repeats this confession in some of their papers.*

Mr. Hocking seems more at ease when he can turn from contemporary facts with which he can be confronted, to arguments borrowed from the ordinary Protestant stock-in-trade of false history and misleading quotations. On his use of these the following observations must suffice: (1) There are some generally recognized occasions when it is difficult to protect lawful secrets, and on such occasions, and those only, whilst moralists like Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Paley, and others, teach that the proper cause is to tell a plain lie, Liguori and others say you must not do that, but may use a phrase in a sense which is verbally true, though sure to be taken by the questioner in its more usual sense. For some account of this question the reader may refer to a Catholic Truth Society's tract, entitled, *Dr. Horton on Catholic Truthfulness*. Mr. Hocking must know, however, that this teaching has nothing whatever to do with the special ways of Catholics or Jesuits, or is intended to justify in any way the kind of lies he ascribes to them. (2) If Mr. Hocking will take the pains to inform himself more correctly as to the teaching of Mariana and Escobar, and as to the circumstances of the attempted assassinations of William of Orange and Henri Quatre, he will find that the Jesuits are wholly blameless of the cruel charge which originated only in the malevolence of their adversaries.

As to the use made of his private letters by the contributor, Mr. Hocking must know that it was perfectly justifiable. In these letters he was supplying information which was asked for expressly with a view to a criticism of his book.

## Reviews.

---

### I.—POSITIVE THEOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

IT would be a great mistake, and yet it is one into which the theological student is apt to fall, to conceive the relation between patristic and scholastic theology after such a fashion as to suppose that the great schoolmen have merely stated with precision, systematized, and evolved, a number of dogmatic propositions which are to be found, indeed, in the works of the Greek and Latin Fathers, but which the Fathers had not always expressed with sufficient exactitude, and had not as yet adequately placed in their due relations one with another. The fact is that the schoolmen give us both more and less than the Fathers. More, inasmuch as they have developed and in some sense rationalized Christian dogma; less, inasmuch as they have left in great measure untouched a good deal of patristic exegesis and speculation, which did not so well lend itself to their systematizing process. From the days of Petavius downwards greater attention has been paid to the works of the Fathers than previously; and yet the manner in which they have been treated by the greater number of Catholic theologians, leaves much to be desired.

The majority of treatises on positive theology . . . have had for their object to show the agreement of universal tradition with the faith of the Roman Church, and this purpose has given to them a Western character. The order of subjects, the division and subdivisions, the point of view, all has been borrowed from the schoolmen; and it would seem that their authors have been chiefly occupied in fitting suitable Greek texts into a Latin framework. I do not deny that this method sufficiently brings into evidence the unity of Catholic faith in all times and places. But in thus mingling the waters which flow from different sources, we make each stream to lose its own characteristic taste.

<sup>1</sup> *Études de Théologie Positive sur la Sainte Trinité. Troisième Série. Théories Grecques des Processions Divines.* Par Th. de Régnon, de la C. de J. 2 vols. Paris: Victor Retaux.

Very different from this is the method of a purely historical criticism. In order rightly to appreciate the condition of men's minds at any given epoch and amid a particular set of circumstances, one must lay aside all pre-conceived judgments, and place oneself in the period and among the circumstances; one must learn to live with the men of the time, to speak their language, to listen to what they say and to all that they say, having in mind, as they had in mind, what to them was past, but also shutting out of view that future which they could not know.<sup>1</sup>

The history of dogma, as every one knows, has been treated with immense learning by Harnack and others of his school, but has been dealt with by them under the limitations necessarily imposed by a want of true and living sympathy with the subject in hand. It is a matter for rejoicing that Catholic writers in our own day have begun to awake to the importance of the subject. Mgr. Ginoulhiac's *Histoire du Dogme* will be known to many of our readers, who will also have made acquaintance with the earlier volumes of Père de Régnon's *Études de Théologie Positive sur la Sainte Trinité*. Death found the last-named writer literally at work on the subject of his choice, for he was discovered dead in his chair with a section of the MS. of the work now under review open before him. This "third series" of his "studies" assuredly in no way falls short of the excellence of his previous volumes, and in the regrettable dearth of such works amid the deluge of theological textbooks with which the market is at present flooded, it is not too much to say that Père de Régnon's dissertations will be found indispensable to the Catholic theologian who aspires to something better than that modicum of cut-and-dried mental pabulum which suffices for the passing of an examination.

The volumes before us deal with the "theories of the Greek Fathers concerning the Divine Processions," and their great value—at least, from one point of view—lies in this, that they remind us of the necessary limitations of our theological knowledge. The average student is apt, perhaps, to forget that all the precision, all the subtle distinctions and sub-distinctions of scholastic theology, do not, after all, lift us out of that region of "analogous" concepts and figurative language, by means of which alone our thoughts of God and

<sup>1</sup> "Comme eux connaissant le passé, mais comme eux ignorant la suite à venir."  
(De Régnon, iii. i. 58.)



of the divine mysteries can be built up and expressed. Our Lord's own method of conveying theological instruction was to set it forth by means of a great variety of parables and figurative utterances, no one of which expressed more than a fraction of the truth. And while it was no doubt intended that the Christian dogmas should be discussed and systematized and defined, it was surely not intended that we should lose sight of the essentially tentative character of all efforts to grasp mysteries which of their very nature are beyond the reach of our faculties. Nor could any kind of study more effectively impress this upon the mind of the thoughtful student than that of the history of dogmatic speculation.

The limits of our space will not allow of illustration by means of extracts, but the mere mention of some of the passages in Père de Régnon's posthumous book which have seemed to us most interesting may help to secure for these volumes the attention which they deserve. In vol. i. pp. 88, seq., the author deals with the use made by the Fathers of the theophanies of the Old Testament for the defence of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity against Sabellianism and Arianism respectively. On pp. 106, seq., will be found a highly suggestive treatment of the subject of our adoptive sonship. The author's "*Digressions sur l'Exegèse*,"<sup>1</sup> *a propos* of the rival schools of Alexandria and Antioch, embody a strong plea for the careful study and the courageous use of the "mystical sense" of Holy Scripture as a counterpoise to the depressing tendency of modern biblical criticism, whether textual or analytical. In the eighteenth and nineteenth Dissertations, on the Son as the Image of the Father, and as the Divine Logos or Word (or "Reason"), the reader will find more than one acute discussion of views put forward by Petau (Petavius). Turning to the second volume, we find on pp. 209, seq., an interesting historical sketch, based on contemporary documents, of the difficulties which arose out of the introduction of the "*Filioque*" into the Nicene Creed; and the last Dissertation of all<sup>2</sup> contains an altogether luminous exposition of the Catholic doctrine concerning the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the human soul. By some readers this may not improbably be found the most useful portion of the whole work, bearing as it does so directly and immediately on ascetical theology. Here, too, Petau is called to task, and it is interesting to see

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 146, seq.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 501, seq.

how an undue attachment to a technical term of his own coinage (*οὐσιώδης*, not used by others in this connection) has led him into considerable confusion, and has blinded him to the plain teaching of authors whom he has tried to press into the service of his own particular theory. While, however, Père de Régnon has felt himself constrained to express his dissent from Petau on various points of patristic theology, he would himself have been the first to admit that the labours of that indefatigable and voluminous writer have made his own work possible.

The passages which we have specified as most interesting to ourselves, for the most part lie somewhat aside from the main purpose of the treatise before us. Its principal topics appeal of course to the theologian *ex professo*, and with reference to them we must be content to say that the author sets in the clearest light the main features of the intellectual environment which called forth the efforts of successive Doctors of the Church to formulate her dogmas in such a manner that their defenders might be safe against attack. The relation of the Fathers to one another and to contemporary heresy, and the interrelations of the various heresies among themselves, are very clearly stated.

---

## 2.—RUE.<sup>1</sup>

*Rue* will puzzle the readers of *Spikenard*; yet to discerners of spirits their kinship is evident enough. The theme of *Rue* is a friendship less strictly platonic than that which Tennyson's *In Memoriam* has immortalized; less blindly emotional than that which finds utterance in Shakespeare's sonnets. Blent, like human nature, of two elements, its perfection is shown to lie not in the extinction but in the complete subjugation of the lower love by the higher; and it is with the process of this conflict that the verses are occupied. Consecrated and strengthened by restraint, weakened and desecrated by passionate effusiveness, human affection, which under sin's rule was the instrument of man's destruction and degradation, became, under Christ, the instrument of redemption and upraising.

In the first of the three sections which divide the story we

<sup>1</sup> *Rue*. By Laurence Housman. London: Unicorn Press, 1899.

find the higher love chafing angrily against the insistence of the lower, and indeed against the whole constitution of human life with its lamentable and perplexing limits, its conflicting instincts, its burdensome and all but impossible obligations. But eventually love is saved; the corruptive leaven of selfishness is purged out, and the single desire to secure his friend's best happiness prevails, albeit at the bitter cost of separation and self-suppression. Nor is the energy that makes this sacrifice possible, to be accredited to the naked spirit, but to the full humanity, the sense no longer resisting, but lending its subjugated forces to the spirit, which without such aid were unequal to the task.

These conceptions are developed with great beauty and subtlety of expression, though now and then subtlety tends to pass into confusion, where the poet tries to crowd multiple and incompatible senses into the same verse. He has a singular mastery over what in unskilful hands may be the most commonplace and sing-song of all metres, but which in his is ever dignified and restrained, never for a moment wearisome. He is strangely little haunted by Tennyson or Shakespeare; except perhaps in the set of verses beginning: "Grant that I have no other claim," which re-echo many of the sonnets.

In the third part, the loved one dies (at least for artistic purposes; for here, as in *Spikenard*, Mr. Housman is the creator of purely imaginary phases of soul), and the purification of love is completed—the once rebel lover being starved back to the feet of Christ, since in no other name and under no other law can love be saved.

Of incidental points, it may be noticed that the poet is not so unorthodox as he thinks in his repeated contention that the griefs and needs of others are the reasons why suicide is reprehensible, for herein he only states imperfectly the fuller truth that we are by nature not isolated units, but are bound up with others; and that the selfish man is already a suicide, even though he yet breathe the breath of animal life.

Times and again, the deepest note of pessimism is struck for a moment; and indeed nowhere is there a very firm expression of trust in the larger hope. That our view of life is relative and partial leaves us uncertain as to whether the totality of things be evil or good, unless there be some clear indication in the nature of our actual experience as to the character of the Deity.

At times the poet fears the revelation of evil that might come with fuller light :

Give darkness that it may be dark,  
And heal my eyes of light.

Or again :

More darkness, Lord ! lest I should see  
Thy Face and understand.

But eventually he comes to acquiesce in "the mysteries of pain"—

And find one law uplifted chief  
All other laws above,  
That Earth cannot contain its grief  
Nor Heaven contain its love—

that the griefs of earth pass up to pierce the heart of God Himself; and to let loose upon earth the streams of love which Heaven is not big enough to contain. This conception of God's "finitude" is touched boldly in the lines :

Or does He too dip Feet in fire,  
And share the thirster's thirst,  
And listen to man's great desire  
Holding a heart to burst ?

Whatever philosophical theism may say, Christianity must answer in the affirmative.

---

### 3.—BENVENUTO CELLINI.<sup>1</sup>

If "The Prig's" taste in biography seems to run rather in the direction of "freaks," it cannot at the same time be denied that it is the extraordinary, as a rule, and not the commonplace, which excites the reader's interest. In any case, we venture to say that this sketch of that wilful, unprincipled, but wonderfully talented genius, Benvenuto Cellini, is as attractive in its way as a novel; and we mean a novel not merely of the days of Horace Walpole, but of our own post-Dumasian epoch, familiar with the creations of Anthony Hope and Stanley J. Weyman. Slight as it is, and devoid of any pretensions to original research in the strict sense of the term, the volume before us cannot be counted a superfluous book. There is much truth in what the author says, that "if ever there was a character

<sup>1</sup> *Chisel, Fen, and Poignard, or Benvenuto Cellini: his Times and his Contemporaries.* By the author of *The Life of a Prig*. London: Longmans, 1899.

which ought not to be estimated at its owner's valuation, that character was Benvenuto Cellini's." For the ordinary English reader the autobiography, which is accessible in a number of low-priced translations, practically holds the field. M. Eugène Plon's magnificent work would be too expensive, even if it were not too big, to be in favour at the circulating libraries. The sketch before us is short enough to be read almost at a sitting, and while it well preserves the flavour of that extraordinarily entertaining account of the art, artists, and art patrons of Italy in the sixteenth century which Cellini has left behind him, it keeps sufficiently in view the untrustworthiness of the writer, and makes no scruple of characterizing his excesses as they deserve. Here is "the Prig's" estimate of Cellini as a chronicler of facts :

Perhaps a fanciful, though not very erroneous analysis of the value of Cellini's statements might be made as follows : fifty per cent. of the tolerable truthfulness of the good story-teller, twenty-five per cent. of the quasi-veracity of the gossiping letter-writer, fifteen per cent. of the quasi-mendacity of the man with a grievance, and ten per cent. of the unqualified mendacity of a deliberate liar, of a somewhat rare but particularly morbid and malignant character.

It is certainly aggravating to have a man like Benvenuto described by Mr. John Addington Symonds as "a devout Catholic," whose "religion had but little effect upon his life," and to be assured that at this period "the separation between religion and morality was complete in Italy." We are proportionately grateful, therefore, to the author of the book before us for the passage—which we hope his non-Catholic readers will not skip—in which he puts the matter in its true light, and quotes some singularly apposite remarks from the writings of Cardinal Newman :

Neither Cellini [says our author] nor any one else whose religion had little effect upon his life could be a devout Catholic ! There is nothing devout in sinning against God and man. Cellini may have had faith. Very possibly, like the devils, he believed and trembled. Indeed, he may have held the theory sarcastically propounded by Dryden :

A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,  
And leave the luggage of good works behind.

If we have spoken of this volume as of one which has involved no original research, we should be far from qualifying it as a mere piece of book-making. It is impossible for so well-informed and cultivated a writer to touch an historical theme of

this kind without adorning it with many pertinent remarks and apt quotations drawn from his own wide reading. The book has a *cachet* of its own, and helped out as it is by some excellent, though rather unequal illustrations, it makes a thoroughly attractive volume. If we had a criticism to make, it would be that the title is a good deal too big for the book

---

#### 4.—OXFORD CONFERENCES.<sup>1</sup>

We are glad to welcome Father Moss's neat little volume of lectures on Grace. The subject is one that is in danger of being pushed into the background, owing to the pressing importance of so many religious questions that were scarcely raised, or if raised, were more easily and superficially answered, a few generations ago. Yet, however scholastic and esoteric in some of its ramifications, the theology of Grace has such an intimate bearing on Christian practice, that no intelligent Catholic can afford to be ignorant of those broader and more general aspects that Father Moss deals with so ably and clearly.

By aid of very abundant, familiar, and sharply-defined illustrations, he contrives to make many of the obscurer points of theology stand out precise and distinct, shorn of that fringe of vagueness which is so irksome to impatient minds of such an auditory as that to which the lectures were addressed. That he is consistently Thomist throughout gives him an advantage in point of clearness over those who, taking the bulk of the great Doctor's principles and conclusions, shrink from what seems to them his ruthless predeterminism. It is well for the Church at large, that each member of the ever-insoluble antinomy should have its defenders—these demonstrating the omnipotence of God and asserting the freedom of man; those demonstrating the freedom of man and asserting the omnipotence of God—each holding to both. Better, perhaps, for those who are not too anxious for a forced reconciliation, but are content to know that the absolute truth lies in a mean, to us as yet inaccessible.

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Conferences.* Summer Term, 1899. By Father Raphael Moss, O.P. London: Kegan Paul, 1900.

5.—THE NEW HALL COMMUNITY.<sup>1</sup>

*The History of the New Hall Community* is printed for private circulation only, but not a few of our readers may be glad to know of its appearance—both those who were formerly pupils in the convent school, and the wider circle which takes a lively interest in whatever appertains to the history of our English Catholic institutions. The authoress, who modestly conceals her name, but has done her work very successfully, is a member of the community, and the occasion of the compilation was the centenary of their life at New Hall, which was commemorated in the summer of 1898. From two sources the exceptional interest of the subject springs—from the history of the old Elizabethan house which in Tudor and early Stuart days was a royal residence, and from the history of the community, which in its Liège days, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, played a noticeable part in the education of English Catholic girls, and afforded an opportunity for the religious life to many English Catholic ladies. Very thrilling is the account from contemporary documents of the flight from Liège to England when the Revolution was beginning to threaten its invasion of the Low Countries. The records of tranquil convent life are less marked by incident, but they have useful lessons to teach outsiders as well as the nuns themselves. The book has several illustrations, and also gives a complete list of the nuns from 1645 to the present day.

---

6.—THE ABBÉ FRETTE'S ST. PAUL.<sup>2</sup>

The Abbé Frette is already known to us by his *Life of Christ*, to which this *Life of St. Paul* forms a good pendant. The style is easy and lively. The Abbé is evidently interested in his sacred theme. If he raises more questions than he is able to solve, that must be put down to the scarcity of data. The details of the Apostle's career leave ample room for conjecture; and biographers will fill them in variously according to their several minds.\*

We think the author a little peremptory in his defence of

<sup>1</sup> *The History of the New Hall Community of Canonesses Regular of the Holy Sepulchre.* With a Preface by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith, S.J. Printed for private circulation. 1899.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Apôtre Saint Paul.* Par l'Abbé S. E. Frette. Paris: Lethielleux.



the Vulgate text of Acts ix. 29. Nor is he quite satisfactory in his discussion of Acts xviii. 18, where he seems first to decide that it was Aquila, not St. Paul, who made the vow of cutting off his hair; and then to found upon the text a theory that St. Paul had taken, and observed all his life, the Nazarite vow of total abstinence. The thing is not unlikely, but it can never be proved. Anyhow, the vow was St. Paul's, not Aquila's, if we are not to do violence to St. Luke's Greek text. On 2 Cor. xii. 7 the Abbé argues well against the supposition of ophthalmia, but fails to recognize the difficulties in the way of the interpretation commonly favoured by ascetics.

---

### *Literary Record.*

---

#### I.—BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

The Catholic Truth Society sends *Led by a Dream, and Other Stories*, by Miss Katharine Tynan, whose gift of making known to us her own people, with all the pathos and humour of their lives, is so well known to us; *Words on Wings*, a booklet by Miss Sewell, containing pregnant thoughts from saints and well-known writers, one for each day of the year; a reprint of Dom F. A. Gasquet's and Dr. William Barry's Conference essays, on the *Layman in the pre-Reformation Parish*, and the *Layman in the Church*; *Luther and Tetzl*, by Father Sydney F. Smith, S.J., an addition to the series of Historical Papers; and *A Life of St. Dominic*, by Father Benedict Tickell, O.P., arranged for magic lantern use. We have received also from Messrs. Burns and Oates, *The Divine Consoler*, a translation from the French of the Lazarist Father Angeli, of some Visits to the Blessed Sacrament in use among the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul. *Prayers before and after Communion* (Michly and Sinclair, Port Elizabeth) is a miniature booklet of solid and simple prayers arranged by Miss A. L. P. Dorman. *The Paraclete* (Messrs. Benziger) is a manual of instruction and devotion to the Holy Ghost, by the Capuchin Father Marianus Fiège.

Messrs. Herder send a second edition of an arrangement of the *Imitatio Christi*, the speciality of which is that to each chapter are annexed parallel passages culled from other works of à Kempis. The materials were collected by Dr. H. Gerlach,

a Canon of Limburg, but were edited after his death by Dr. Laurenz Werthmann. Every word from à Kempis is golden, and no wonder the first edition proved so popular.

*The Catholic Directory* is an indispensable friend, and it was a distress to us all to learn that a fire at the printing works had delayed its appearance, though fortunately the delay has proved short. There seems nothing special to note in the present issue, save the record of an increase during the year of forty-three priests and twenty places of worship; also a short explanation of the Jubilee.

It is a sign of the growing importance of the Catholic Church in English life that a general publisher thinks it may be worth his while to bring out a *Catholic Year Book*, as Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. have now done. Its special features, beyond what we are accustomed to have, are a thought from the *Imitation* for each day of the year, a brief list of the notable Catholic events of the previous year, and some details about the Religious Orders and Congregations, and other institutions. This last is very incomplete and unsystematic, though the editor apologises for the defect on the ground that many contributions were not sent him in time. It is, for instance, odd to find an account of two Congregations of Notre Dame with which we are less familiar, whilst there is no reference to the well-known Congregation which has so many convents and does such valuable work. There is a want of proportion too, due apparently to a natural readiness of minor Congregations to use the opportunity of making themselves known, while those of more prominence were impatient of giving particulars.

*Who's Who* and *The Englishwoman's Year Book* are likewise useful friends. The latter is simply invaluable for all who wish to know how our women live, what opportunities of education and work are open to them, and what benevolent institutions are at their service.

---

## II.—MAGAZINES.

*Some contents of foreign Periodicals :*

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (January 6 and 20.)  
 Boniface VIII. and the Jubilee. Presentiments and Telepathy.  
 A Diary of the Holy Year. The Vatican at Work. The  
 Concordat between the First Consul and Pius VII.

REVUE BÉNÉDICTINE, January, 1900 (which now for the first time appears as a quarterly).

Catholica. *O. Rottmanner*. The Testament of Our Lord. *G. Morin*. The Benedictine Congregation of Chezal-Benoit. *U. Berlière*. The Philosophical Teaching of the Benedictines at St. Vaast. *R. Proost*. The Religious Crisis in the Church of England. *B. Camm*. The Musical System of the Greek Church. *H. Gaisser*. Reviews, &c.

LES ÉTUDES RELIGIEUSES. (January 5 and 20.)

The Inopportuneness of a Law against Associations. *H. Prélôt*. Dogma and Catholic Thought in the Nineteenth Century. *J. Bainvel*. An English Catholic Novel ("One Poor Scruple"). *H. Bremond*. The Day after the Victory. *J. Burnichon*. The Apostolic Origin of the New Testament. *L. Méchineau*. Religion and Religions in the Nineteenth Century. *R. M. de la Broise*. Reviews, &c.

LA REVUE GÉNÉRALE. (January.)

The Catholic Renaissance in England. *Ch. Woeste*. Julius II. *A. Goffin*. The Communal Elections. *P. Lefebvre*. The Supreme Court. *E. Trogan*. Reviews, &c.

DER KATHOLIK. (January.)

The Testament of Our Lord. *F. X. Funk*. The Epistle to the Romans. *Dr. Kuhlmann*. The *Liber de Rebaptismate*. *A. Beck*. The Dogmatic Principles of Biblical Criticism. *A. Fischer Colbrie*. Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (January.)

On the Threshold of the Twentieth Century. *A. Baumgartner*. The Visit to the Seven Churches in Rome. *M. Meschler*. Our Lady's Church in Luxemburg. *J. Braun*. Bonifatiana. *J. Hilgers*. Reviews, &c.

L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE. (January.)

The Holy Year. *R. Parayre*. The Triple Alliance. *Comte J. Grabinski*. M. Th. Ribot and the Psychology of the Feelings. *E. Blanc*. The Very Rev. Mother Marie Eugénie de Jesus. *Dom P. Renaudin*. The Epistle to the Galatians. *E. Jacquier*. Reviews, &c.

4

1